



PROCESSED

JUN 24 1996

GTU LIBRARY

BIBLICAL STUDIES

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor:

Rev Professor J. C. McCullough
Union Theological College
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN

Associate Editors:

Rev. Professor Ernest Best
13 Newmill Gdns
St. Andrews KT16 8RY

Rev. Professor E.A. Russell
Union Theological College
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN

Assistant Editors:

Rev. D. P. Ker
Rev. D. J. Templeton

Editorial Advisory Panel:

Rev. Dr. David Hill, 3 Ashdill Court, 26 Westbourn Rd., Sheffield S10 2QQ.
Rev. Dr. W. S. Campbell, Westhill College, Selly Oak, Birmingham 29.
Dr. J.G. McConville, 146 Leckhampton Rd., Cheltenham, GL53 0DH, England,
Rev. Dr. R.J. McKelvey, 64 Brooklawn Drive, Withington, Manchester M20 3GZ.
Rev. Martin O'Callaghan, Trench House, St Mary's College, Belfast BT11
Professor E. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford.
Rev. Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast BT9 5BY.
Mr David Payne, 2 Westfield Ave., Watford, Herts. WD2 4EB

Subscriptions

Individuals £8.00 Sterling

Institutions £13.00 Sterling or \$26.00 US

All subscriptions should be made payable to "Irish Biblical Studies" and addressed to the Editor.

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Volume 18, April 1996

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF
REV. PROF. E. A. RUSSELL, B.A., B.D.,
M.TH. D.D.

Contents

J. C. O'Neill	<i>The Jews in the Fourth Gospel</i>	58-74
Hamilton Moore	<i>The Apocalyptic Hope in the New Testament</i>	75-99
John Thompson	<i>How to Read Karl Barth. The Shape of his Theology, by George Hunsinger. Article Review</i>	100-112

FOREWORD

It is a great pleasure to present the next 3 issues of *Irish Biblical Studies* to Professor E.A.Russell, the founder of *Irish Biblical Studies* as a *Festschrift* on his eightieth birthday. Rev. Edward Augustine Russell, B.A. (Lond.), B.D.(Hons.Lond.), M.Th (Lond.), D.D. (Belfast) was born in 1916, and received his secondary education at the Royal Belfast Academical Institution, where he became prizeman in classics. After a short career in business, he read classics in the University of London, and theology in Magee College, Londonderry, the Presbyterian College, Belfast and New College, Edinburgh. On completion of his formal studies he was ordained as a minister of the Presbyterian Church and served as minister firstly in Donacloney Presbyterian Church and later Mountpottinger. In 1961 he was called to the Chair of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology in the Presbyterian College and in 1981 was appointed Principal, a post which he held till his retirement in 1987.

Throughout his life Professor Russell has pursued with characteristic thoroughness and enthusiasm several well defined aims. His interest in the Scriptures and his desire to make them understandable and relevant to modern generations has sustained most of his life's work. It was seen in his work as a minister, as a General Assembly Evangelist, and above all as a professor in College, where he encouraged the weaker students, challenged the lazy and stimulated the stronger students (several of whom have contributed to these essays) to undertake further research at Masters and Doctorate level. He has taken an active interest in translation work, publishing articles on various translations, as well as on some important textual variants, acting on the translation committee of the *Revised English Bible*, and of course, founding this journal *Irish Biblical Studies* dedicated to encourage younger scholars to undertake and publish their own research on Biblical themes. He also worked hard to encourage Biblical research in Ireland, arranging many seminars and groups which would enable scholars from all of Ireland to co-operate in their work. His contributions to the field of Biblical Studies in Ireland were recognised by his peers when they made him a life member of the Irish Biblical Association.

Perhaps because of his overriding love of the Scriptures a second great enthusiasm in his life is Jewish Christian dialogue. Not only did he research this topic academically (for example in his articles on Anti-Semitism in Matthew's Gospel) but he was also deeply involved on the ground. He was the convenor of the General Assembly Committee which was responsible for such dialogue and with Sister Carmel from the Sisters of Zion, worked tirelessly to promote dialogue and understanding among Jews and Christians in Ireland and abroad.

His main work, however, has been as a servant of Christ and of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. He has served with distinction on many boards and Committees of the Church, convening the Committee on Jewish Relations, the Belfast College Board and the Doctrine Committee. As a Professor he has enthused, inspired and influenced several generations of students in the College and, as Principal has lead the Faculty through important years of expansion and development. He has represented the church on many occasions and served on its behalf on such important commissions as the Warnock Commission on Ethics. His work for the wider church has, however, never blunted his appreciation of the local congregation and his interest in the congregation where he was brought up lead him to write a history of Oldpark Presbyterian Church.

It has been a great personal pleasure and honour for me to prepare these essays and to present them to the one who first taught me New Testament, who guided me through my Ph.D. research, who founded *IBS* and encouraged me to publish in it, but above all who passed on some of his enthusiasm and love for the Bible for which he has been known throughout his working life. He has been a true *Doktorvater*. We wish him well in his continuing retirement.

The Editor.

PUBLICATIONS.

1970

'The "Elder" and the Latin Bible' *BibTheol* 20:16-24

1977

'Church and State in the New Testament' *IrTheolQuart* 44: 192-207

'Some Aspects of Change in the New Testament'
BibTheol 27:9-19

1978

'The Canaanite Woman and the Gospels' in *Studia Biblica* Vol. 2 (ed. E.A. Livingstone) 263-300

1979

'"They believed Philip preaching" (Acts 8:12)' *IBS* 1: 169-176

'Ministry of Word and Sacrament in the New Testament'
IBS 1:51-56

1980

'The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. Some Observations' *IBS* 2: 84-94

1981

'Fidelity or Wishful thinking in recent N.T. translations'
IBS 3: 93-105

1982

'Divine Healing and Scripture' *IBS* 4:123-157

'The Image of the Jew in Matthew's Gospel' in *Studia Evangelica* Vol 3. (ed. E. A. Livingstone) 1982.429-442

1984

'Convincing or merely Curious? A Look at some recent Writings on Galatians' *IBS* 6: 156-176

1985

'The Gospel of Mark: Pastoral Response to a Life or Death Situation?' *IBS* 7: 206-223

1986

'A Plea for Tolerance (Mark 9: 38-40)' *IBS* 8: 154-160

'Antisemitism in the Gospel of Matthew' *IBS* 8: 183-196

1987

'The New Jerusalem Bible and Modern Translations' *IBS* 9: 175-185

1989

'The Growth of Christianity over the first five Centuries in the Light of Jewish Faith' *IBS* 11: 73-93

'The Image of the Jew in Matthew's Gospel' *ProcIRBibAssoc* 12 (1989)

'Godly concord: *en homonia* (1 Clement 9.4)' *IBS* 11: 186-196

1991

'Some Reflections on Humour in Scripture and Otherwise' *IBS* 13: 199-210

THE JEWS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Professor J. C. O'Neill

Ted Russell, the first editor of this journal, had a sharp eye for the significant, and it was no accident that Issue 2 of January 1980 contained George Appleton's lecture on the Jewishness of Jesus,¹ and that in Volume 3 for April 1983 we find the editor himself labelling as wishful thinking the Living Bible translation of John 1.17: "For Moses gave us only the Law with its rigid demands and merciless justice, while Jesus Christ brought us loving forgiveness as well."²

I offer in his honour an argument designed to rescue the originally published Fourth Gospel from the charge of being anti-Jewish, a charge to which it seems so obviously liable. The argument is simple. Most of the incidents of the words *the Jews* in John's Gospel are pointless additions to the narratives; the story itself makes no use of the expressions and in no way calls for the additions. The only point of the words derives from the supposed needs of later readers: but not the polemical needs of the later readers so much as their natural assumption that they are reading of some exotic culture now existing only as a marginal phenomenon in their society. I do not deny that the attempt to meet these needs of the readers is anti-Jewish, but I do not think it is an organized polemic, the "technical term" of an imagined author. In short, I reject the notion that the words *the Jews* (at least in the majority of cases) belong to the fabric of the Fourth Gospel, and I also reject the notion that they represent the conscious device of an author.

The evidence for this hypothesis consists of two different sorts. Each sort supports the conclusion suggested by the other sort, which naturally raises the probability that the argument as a whole is likely to be true. The first sort is an argument from the demands of the narrative itself whereby I shall try to show that the words *the Jews* are in no way intrinsic to the story; they are redundant. The second sort is an argument from the state of the textual tradition. The

¹ IBS 2 (1980) 27-39

² E. A. Russell, "Fidelity or Wishful Thinking in recent New Testament Translation?", IBS 3 (1981) 93-105.

textual tradition often throws up examples of (a) manuscripts that read the words *the Jews* where the better manuscripts do not have them—a powerful support for the hypothesis that scribes had a tendency to put in the words; (b) manuscripts that omit the words *the Jews* where the presumed better manuscripts offer us the words—and this, in view of what we know of the history of the church from Marcion onwards, is not likely to be a scribal tendency to omit but rather a scribal tendency to add which has captured the tradition in most of its branches; and (c) manuscripts that show that the position of the words *the Jews* in their context is uncertain—the frequent sign that we should suspect the words of being a gloss.

1. A Feast of the Jews &c.

The information that a certain feast was a feast of the Jews is entirely unnecessary in a Gospel that refers naturally to Moses lifting up a serpent in the wilderness, or to chief priests, or to Jerusalem as where feasts are celebrated. The reader needed to know that it was feast time and not some other time or what feast it was, but the note of *the Jews* is quite unnecessary. Take away the words of *the Jews* and the like in the following cases, and nothing at all is lost: 2.6,13; 3.1; 5.1; 6.4; 7.2; 11.55. The textual evidence that the words were added by scribes is strong.

2.6 (c) Transposition: standing according to the cleansing of the Jews] p⁶⁶ p⁷⁵ according to the cleansing of the Jews standing; ✠ * omits *standing*. The pertinent information is that the jars were standing there for the purification ceremonies. That the Jews had these ceremonies is irrelevant to the story. The transposition in the papyri probably shows that an original gloss got into the text in two different positions. The omission in ✠ is perhaps a sign that the words of *the Jews* were added, forcing the dropping of *standing*.

2.13: And near was the Passover of the Jews. Simply, passover was near. A reader who knew what pascha was would not need of *the Jews*; 579 felt the difficulty and added *the feast* of the Jews, following the example of 6.4.

3.1: Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. Nicodemus has already been identified as one of the Pharisees. In the story, he is called a *teacher of Israel* (3.10; the article is indefinite, as the AV knew) and nothing

is said about his position of ruler. The information seems derived from John 7.50. Omit *a ruler of the Jews*.

5.1 (b) Omission. a feast of the Jews] A feast of unleavened bread; 131 adds: the [feast of] tabernacles, following 7.2. The Synoptic tradition that Jesus only went to Jerusalem once during his ministry, at Passover, would have helped produce the majority reading. It was bad enough that Jesus went up to another Passover apart from the one at which he was crucified (John 2.13; cf. 6.4). A is probably right.

6.4 (b) Omission: Passover was near, a feast of the Jews. See 2.13; the explanatory words after *pascha* are unnecessary. The verse is not in 472.

7.2: there was near the feast of the Jews, Tabernacles. The nominative *Tabernacles* could stand alone (Josephus, *Antiquities* 8.123; 11.154; 13.372; 15.50). The more common expression would have been *the feast of Tabernacles* with *Tabernacles* a dependent genitive (LXX). Take *the feast of the Jews* as an unnecessary gloss, and translate: Tabernacles was near.

11.55 (b) Omission: There was near the Passover of the Jews] Syriac Sinaiticus omits *of the Jews*. Translate: Passover was near.

18.12: and the servants of the Jews. Clearly *of the Jews* is a gloss. A scribe thought *χιλίαρχος* might be mistaken for a Roman centurion so he explained that the assistants were of the Jews.

18.20 (c) Transposition. The words of Jesus: I always taught in the synagogue and in the temple where all [or always] the Jews come together, and in secret I said nothing] 1093 transposes the words *the Jews* to a position after *come together*. The present text is ludicrous, the point being, not that Jews come together but that all gather.

19.6 (a) Addition. Family 13 adds the unnecessary information that the high priests were high priests of the Jews, a patent gloss.

19.20 (c) Transposition. The superscription many read of the Jews] D: many of the Jews read. There is no point in specifying the nationality of the readers of the superscription on the cross; the point is that *many* read it because the place where they crucified Jesus was near the city. Omit *of the Jews*.

19.21a (b) Omission. so spoke to Pilate the chief priest of the Jews] 477 473 ff² Syriac Tatian omit *of the Jews*. Unnecessary information.

19.40: as is the custom with the Jews to prepare for entombment. There is no point in labelling it a Jewish custom; the point is that the body was properly prepared for placing in a tomb.

19.42 (b) Omission: because of the day of preparation of the Jews] Old Latin b ff² n r Syriac Sinaiticus and Peshitta omit *of the Jews*. The story only requires the reference to the Friday and a reader who knew the term would not need a note that this was a Jewish term. The readers a scribe had in mind might.

2 For fear of the Jews

There are three references to people acting in a defensive way for fear of the Jews; some people hold back from following Jesus (7.13; 19.38) and the disciples in Jerusalem after the crucifixion keep the doors shut for fear of the Jews. The actual phrase *for fear of the Jews* is found in Esther 8.17, as Walter Bauer pointed out.³ In Esther, many of the citizens of the empire of Ahasuerus, which stretched from India to Ethiopia, became Jews for fear of the Jews, when Esther won light and gladness and joy and honour for her people. But that was a situation where the Jews were living in a foreign setting and the fear in John's Gospel was simply fear of the dominant people, who, like those who were afraid, were all Jews. Nothing is added to the narrative by saying that those who were afraid were afraid of Jews. It looks as though a scribe noted the parallel in Esther 8.17 and inserted the words required to make up a stock phrase.

7.12-13 The people were divided but no one dared to speak openly about him for fear.

9.22 (see below)

19.38 Joseph of Arimathea was a disciple of Jesus, but in secret because of fear.

20.19 The doors were shut because of fear.

³ *Das Johannesevangelium*, Handbuch zum NT 6, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1925) at John 7.13, p. 105.

3. Jerusalemites become Jews

There are two places where the actors in the story are from Jerusalem, which is important; scribes have turned that reference into a reference to their being Jews.

1.19 (c) Transposition. when they sent to him, the Jews from Jerusalem, priests and Levites] 124 Syriac Sinaiticus and Curetonian transpose and read: when they sent to him, from Jerusalem, the Jews [sent] priests and Levites. There was no need to specify who did the sending; the important issue is that the ones who were sent to John the Baptist came from Jerusalem. The scribe who added the words in the margin (that have come to be lodged in two different places in the text) meant to indicate the ruling Jews, but that is quite unnecessary in the story, where Jerusalem carries all the menace required. Translate: when they sent from Jerusalem priests and Levites.

11.19 (b) Omission. Many of the Jews had come to Martha and Mary to comfort them for their brother] D reads: many of Jerusalem. The point of the story is that it occurred near Jerusalem and that the return of mourners, some of whom believed in Jesus, roused the leaders to take action against him. A reference here to Jews is senseless and only came about because scribes were accustomed to varnish the story with a certain quaintness of distance in which all the actors were labelled Jews.

The subsequent references to those who had come from Jerusalem to comfort the sisters as Jews are all glosses.

11.31 (b) Omission. The Jews who were with her in the house and were comforting her] Syriac Sinaiticus omits: the Jews who were with her in the house. The point is not that they were Jews but that they were comforting her.

11.33: Jesus therefore when he saw her crying and those who had come with her, Jews, crying... The point is not that they were Jews but that they had come with Mary as fellow mourners. Omit *Jews*.

11.36: Then said the Jews, See how he was loving him. The point is that some of the onlookers said this; others were to ask a sharp question in the next verse. The original subject of the verb *they said* was left open, and a scribal glossator has spoilt the story. Translate: Then they said.

11.45: Many therefore of the Jews who came to Mary and saw what he did believed in him. Some of them went to the Pharisees and told them what Jesus had done. The fact that they were all Jews is irrelevant to the story; the true point is that many believed and others went back to Jerusalem to the authorities. Omit *of the Jews*.

11.54 (a) Omission. So Jesus no longer went about openly among the Jews] V reads: among them. The reference to the Jews is pointless since he continues to live among Jews, going no farther than Ephraim in Judaea; the true stress falls on the word *openly* and the reading of V fits very well: openly among them.

12.11 (c) Transposition. For many because of him [Lazarus] went off, of the Jews, and believed in Jesus] D reads: For many of the Jews because of him went off and believed in him; p⁶⁶ reads: For many of the Jews because of him believed in Jesus. The two positions of *of the Jews* in the tradition betray the fact that the words were originally a gloss. They add nothing to the story, being the work of a scribe who wanted to remind the readers that these events occurred long ago when the Jews inhabited their own land.

4. Jews as Ruling Jews

A great deal has been made of an alleged Johannine usage whereby *the Jews* is regarded as "almost a technical title for *the religious authorities, particularly those in Jerusalem, who are hostile to Jesus*."⁴ There is little doubt that a later scribe could have used the term to refer particularly to the religious leaders, quite conscious of the fact that everyone involved in the story was also ethnically a Jew. By convention in Hellenistic Greek a narrator can refer, for example, to the rulers as Romans in a narrative where all who dwell in Rome, patricians and plebians, are also called Romans (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant 7.12.4,5; 13.1,5), but all is patently obvious in such a narrative. It is quite otherwise in the Fourth Gospel where the words *the Jews* are simply inserted without any narrative explanation. In chapter 7, for instance, the Jews of verse 11 are just anyone; the Jews of verse 13 are the rulers; and the Jews of verse 15 are those who marvel that an untaught man is learned. I find it

⁴ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (i-xii)*. The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1966), p. lxxi.

difficult to attribute this usage to the author of the story. An author would have made something of the play of forces, not using the one term *the Jews* to blur the differences of opinion between rulers and plebs, between some of the people and others. What we have in the Fourth Gospel is a patina of antiquarian scribal corruption laid over an original text which was perfectly clear without it. The scribes are describing the authorities as Jews and the people as Jews to remind the reader that this is a long past situation when the Jewish people had a homeland and a measure of self-government; but the gloss obscures the original narratives that require no such embellishment. The suggestion that the alleged author of the Gospel identified himself and his readers with the underdogs in the story because the author and his readers were up against a dominant Judaism is not likely because the stories often also receive the embellishment that many of the participants, both for and against Jesus, are labelled Jews too (for which see 5 below).

2.18: The Jews therefore answered and said to him, What sign do you show us that you do these things? The insertion of verse 17 has led a scribe to suggest a new subject since verse 17 was about the disciples. But verse 17 is an editorial insertion and the narrative used the link word οὖν to take the reader back to verse 16 and to those who were involved in the cleansing of the temple.⁵ There is no point in saying they were Jews. Translate: These [victims] therefore answered and said to him.

2.20: So the Jews said, Forty and six years was this temple a building. Again the reference to the Jews is pointless. It is Jesus' interlocutors who are questioning him, and that is all we need to know. Translate: So they said.

3.25: There arose therefore a dispute of the disciples of John with a Jew concerning cleansing and they came to John and said to him] p⁶⁶
ⲛ* Θ family 1 family 13 565 the Latin Syriac Curetonian Bohairic
Origen read the plural: with Jews. Both the singular and the plural look like inept glosses. The glossator thought of the Jews as always arguing about ritual matters and introduced them here. The original story was surely about a dispute among the disciples of John about

⁵ W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*, on John 2.18, p. 45. Cf. John 11.3,14.

Jesus. Read: There arose therefore a dispute of the disciples of John and they came to John and said to him.

5.10: So the Jews said to the man healed. For a scribe any issue of the Sabbath involved Jews, but the specifying is beside the point to the original storyteller.

5.12 (a) Addition. The Old Latin adds that the Jews asked him, Who is the man who said to you, Arise and walk? An obvious gloss, but an example of a process that has also affected our better manuscripts, too.

5.15: The man went away and reported to the Jews that Jesus was the one who had made him whole. W adds after *to the Jews* the words *and he said to them*. I suspect that the longer text of W reveals the existence of an early gloss: *and he reported to the Jews*. Translate: The man went away and said to them that Jesus was the one who had made him whole.

5.16 (c) Transposition. And for this reason they began to persecute, the Jews, Jesus because he was doing these things on the sabbath] A Θ Ψ Textus Receptus e q Syriac Sinaiticus Harclean read: they began to persecute Jesus, the Jews, and they were seeking to kill him (cf. 5.18) because... This longer gloss shows that a shorter gloss consisting of the words *the Jews* was embedded in the text of all manuscripts.

5.18a (a) Addition. 579 reads: For this reason therefore the more persecuted the Jews Jesus; 1241 reads: For this reason therefore did they persecute Jesus, the Jews. The words *persecuted the Jews Jesus* make up another gloss, like 5.16.

5.18b (c) Transposition. For this reason therefore the more did they seek him, the Jews, to kill] p⁶⁶ D Tertullian Hilary: For this reason the more the Jews sought him to kill; W 1: For this reason the more sought him to kill, the Jews. The three positions of *the Jews* shows that originally it was a gloss. Translate: For this reason they sought the more to kill him.

7.1 (c) Transposition. for he did not wish in Judaea to walk, because they sought him, the Jews, to kill] 1093 reads: because they sought, the Jews, him to kill; 477 reads: because him the Jews sought to kill. The various positions of *the Jews* show that the words were originally a gloss; they add nothing to the story. It is very unlikely

that here *the Jews* means *the Judaeans* because the glossator goes on to speak of *the feast of the Jews* in 7.2.⁶

9.18: They did not believe, therefore, the Jews, about him, that he was blind. The story so far has made the Pharisees the inquisitors (8.13,16), but a scribe wanted to point out that they were powerful Jews; quite unnecessary, and contributing nothing to the narrative.

9.22a: These things said his parents because they were afraid of the Jews. See the discussion of *for fear of the Jews* above. The whole verse has suffered scribal contamination from a general belief that the Jews were the exotic people the story was about.

9.22b (b) Omission. For already had agreed the Jews that if anyone him should confess to be Messiah...] X 213 omit *the Jews*; instead of *the Jews* r and Syriac Sinaiticus have: the Pharisees and the scribes. It is obvious from the narrative that the alleged punishment of anyone who said Jesus was the messiah is a Jewish business; only a later scribe would feel the need to say so.

18.14: It was Caiaphas who had advised the Jews that it was fitting that one man should die for the people. A curiously pointless addition by a scribe who wanted to remind the readers that the Jews, long ago, had their own council in Jerusalem. Who else would he have advised? Translate: It was Caiaphas who had advised that it was fitting that one man should die for the people.

18.31: There said to him, the Jews. Pilate has already been in dialogue with Jesus' accusers. This looks very like a scribal addition of a reference to the Jews because they are about to cite their own law.

18.36: My assistants would have fought so that I would not be given up to the Jews. The reference to the Jews looks very like a pedantic gloss. The only opportunity the disciples had, a scribe would reflect, was in the garden where Jesus was seized by the Temple police, so Jesus must have said they did not fight against the Jews (not the Romans). The reference is pointless and adds nothing to the narrative.

The theory that *the Jews* meant Judeans was argued by C. Dekker, "Grundschrift und Redaktion im Johannesevangelium", NTS 13 (1966-67), 66-80.

18.38 (b) Omission. And saying this [Pilate] again went out to the Jews and said to them] 71 omits *to the Jews*. The reference to the Jews is pointless, but the sentence would have been seen by a scribe as another opportunity to remind the reader that the death of Jesus was the work of the Jews, and not due to Pilate's hostility.

19.7 There answered him the Jews, We have a law. The reference to the law prompted a scribal gloss that the speakers were the leading Jews, the guardians of the law. Translate: They answered him, We have a law.

19.12b: But the Jews cried out saying, If this one you release you are not a friend of Caesar. There is no point in a reference to the Jews. The article can stand by itself at the beginning of a sentence; omit the one word *Jews*, and translate: And they cried out saying &c.

19.14: And he said to the Jews, Behold your king. The reference to the Jews as the audience is without point; a scribe has inserted the words because the original text contained the formula *The King of the Jews*.

19.31: So the Jews, since it was the day of preparation, in order that no bodies should remain on the cross on the sabbath...asked Pilate. To our mind, a change of subject would require a new noun to signify of whom the author was speaking; on that line of reasoning, *the Jews*, or something similar, was needed. Greek, however, can indicate a change of subject by beginning with a simple article: οἱ οὖν, those then. There is curious evidence that *the Jews* is a gloss in that minuscule 660 repeats the article before the noun: οἱ οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. That scribe seems to have taken a marginal reference to the Jews into the text without adjusting the grammar (cf. 7.11).

5. Jews as naturally disputatious

6.41: So murmured the Jew about him. The narrative from 6.22 onwards is about the crowd, and there is no reason to add any further information about them; the words *the Jews* have no point, except that the verb to murmur has appeared which, to a scribe, would suggest the well-known disputatious character of the Jews. The minuscule 69 omits *about him*, perhaps a sign that a gloss, *the Jews*, was allowed to displace part of the original text.

6.52 (c) Transposition. So they disputed with one another, the Jews, saying] p⁷⁵ C D Q family 1 family 13 33 565 1241 read: So they disputed, the Jews, with one another. Again, there is no point in the mention of *the Jews*, except that the glossator has noticed that here is another example of love of argument.

7.11: So the Jews were seeking him in the feast. There is a curious variant reading: οἱ οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in the minuscule 489 and the lectionary 185 (cf. 19.11) which suggests that the original did not have the words *the Jews*. The variant reading is the work of a scribe who copied the gloss wholesale into the text without making the grammatical adjustment of removing the second article. The addition of the words *the Jews* is pointless, except to a glossator who has detected the characteristic curiosity of the Jewish people.

7.15 (b) Variant. So they marvelled, the Jews, saying] 047 reads: So they marvelled, the crowds, saying. The variant is likely to be the original; there is no point in saying that the Jews did the marvelling, except to a scribe who thought the Jews were always disputing.

7.20 (a) Insertion. There answered the crowd, A demon you have] 489 reads: So they answered, the Jews, and said to him, A demon you have. A glossator has made a reference to the contentious crowd as Jews.

7.35: So there said the Jews to themselves, Where is this one about to go? ✠ Old Latin omit *to themselves*. The reference to the Jews is pointless, except to a scribe who thought of them as argumentative.

8.9 (a) Insertion. But those who heard went away one by one] D reads: But each of the Jews went away. A pointless addition showing the scribal tendency to drag in the word *Jews*.

8.13 (a) Insertion. There said therefore to him the Pharisees] 938 1689 read *Jews* for *Pharisees*. The scribes had a tendency in this Gospel to generalize all opponents as Jews.

8.19 (a) Insertion. The minuscule 1200 reads: They said therefore to him, the Jews. Another pointless gloss by a scribe who knew Jews were argumentative.

8.22: They said therefore, the Jews, Will not he kill himself, because he says, Where I go you are not able to come? The reference to the Jews is pointless, except to a scribe who has already made them ask a similar question in John 7.35.

8.25 (a) Insertion. Tatian and the Syriac Peshitta read: They said therefore, the Jews (omitting *to him*). An obvious gloss.

8.31 So spoke Jesus to those believing in him, Jews. At first sight this is a surprisingly favourable reference to Jews: they believed in Jesus. However, the addition of the word *Jews* is the usual pointless reference, and a scribe only thought to add it because he had observed that the same people are accused, in verse 37, of seeking to kill Jesus. He could not resist putting in a hostile marker of what is yet to come: these believers won't last. The true narration read: So spoke Jesus to those believing in him.

8.33 (a) Insertion. They answered him] N A 4 33 69 124 213 262 1071 1093 1555 add *the Jews* after *him*; 579 has just *Jews* in the same place; 1241 has *the Jews* after *answered*. Another pointless gloss—except to scribes who have an interest in reminding the readers that they are reading about an exotic folk, the Jews.

8.41 (a) Insertion. They said to him] 1188 adds *the Jews*.

8.48: There answered the Jews and said to him, Do we not well say that you are a Samaritan. The scribe who inserted *the Jews* was prompted by the following reference to the accusation that Jesus was the illegitimate offspring of a Samaritan soldier; such a reference was not required by the narrative and really adds nothing.

8.52: There said to him the Jews, Now we know that you have a demon; Abraham died... The long dispute is of course a Jewish dispute; only a scribe would feel the need to add a reference to the speakers as Jews.

8.57: There said therefore the Jews to him. Again *the Jews* are named the speakers because the dialogue is about Abraham. The words are pointless, except to a later scribe.

10.19 (b) Omission; (c) Transposition. A division again arose among the Jews because of these words] 213 X read: A division again arose among the crowd; D 33 1241 r Bohairic Syriac Sinaiticus transpose: A division (again) among the Jews arose. The discourse had got on well enough without any specification of the nature of the people in the audience. Only a scribe, who thought of the Jews as a disputatious race would want to add a note that they were Jews. The evidence of both omission and transposition shows that the reference to the Jews was originally a gloss.

10.24: They therefore surrounded him, the Jews, and said to him. Jesus was in Jerusalem, and a scribe thought it nice for his readers to be reminded that the disputatious Jews are again the subject of the story; the original story needed only a crowd.

10.31 (b) Omission. They took up again stones, the Jews, to stone him] W 1242 Syriac Sinaiticus omit *the Jews*. The story required no specification of who wanted to stone Jesus; in a scribe's eyes, the behaviour was typical.

10.33: There answered him the Jews, For a good work we do not stone you but for blasphemy. Nothing is added by the reference to the Jews. A scribe noted the charge of blasphemy and reminded the reader that the action was taking place long ago among the Jews, for whom such a charge was typical.

10.39 (a) Addition. 69 reads: They sought therefore him again, the Jews, to seize; the Old Latin c adds *the Jews* after *to seize*. Both are the common stylized gloss.

11.8 (c) Transposition. Rabbi, now seek they you to stone, the Jews] Θ U family 1 4 22 477 565 579 1241 put *the Jews* before *to stone*, a sure sign that a gloss has become embedded in the text. The reference to the Jews adds nothing to the narrative.

12.9 (c) Transposition. There knew, therefore, the great crowd of the Jews that there he was] 700 transposes *great crowd* after *of the Jews*. The reference to the crowd's being made up of Jews is the work of a glossator, betrayed by the two positions the gloss has found in the text.

13.1 (a) Insertion. The first hand of Ⲙ offers the surprising information: Having loved the Jews who are in the world. A sheer slip.

13.33 (c) Transposition. You sought me, and as I said to the Jews, Where I go] 348 1093 1241 1279 read: And as I said to the Jews, you sought me because where I go. The reference back to 7.33-34; 8.21 is scarcely the work of an evangelist who puts in knowing asides for the Christian reader of the Gospel.⁷ This is the construction of a marginal annotator who adds nothing to the story

⁷ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (xiii-xxi)*, The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1966, on John 13.33 at p. 607.

except a certain learned polish. The fact that the note is lodged in two positions confirms the decision to take *the Jews* as a gloss.

6. Genuine references to the Jews

There are a number of genuine references to the Jews. The dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman depends on the distinction, and the word *Jew* occurs at 4.9 (twice) and 4.22. The statement that salvation is of the Jews (4.22) stands like a rock in the sea of secondary scribal glosses referring to the Jews. Pilate is reported as saying to Jesus, who dared to question him about the charge brought against him, "Am I a Jew?" The implication is that Jesus is a Jew.

The formula *The King of the Jews*, which occurs in 18.33,39; 19.3,19,21b is genuine. There is one reference, however, in which the textual evidence shows that even here there was a tendency to add.

19.21c (b) Omission. but that that one said, King am I of the Jews] 477 reads the emphatic *I* in place of *of the Jews*; B L Ψ 33 transpose *of the Jews* after the verb. The original probably just put emphasis on the self-claim. The reading of 477 and the different position of the reference to the Jews in B and the others indicates that the reference to the Jews was a gloss.

7. The Fourth Gospel assumes Jesus was a faithful Jew

Jesus and his disciples quite naturally keep the statutory feasts in the appropriate manner (2.23; 4.45; 7.8,10,11,14,37; 11.56; 12.12,20; 13.1,29). Jesus' disciples and others call him Rabbi (1.38,49; 3.2, cf. 26; 4.31; 6.25; 9.2; 11.8; 20.16). Jesus speaks of the patriarchs as *our fathers* (4.20; 6.31) or *the fathers* (7.22). He argues from the Law, assuming the Law to be the common authority accepted by him and his opponents (5.39,45-47; 7.19, 22-23; 10.34-36).

Nevertheless, here too, we find a scribal tendency to make the fathers and the Law the possessions of the enemies of Christianity by adding words like *their* and *your*.

6.31 (b) Omission. our fathers] 69* 489 read: your fathers; 047 omits *our*.

6.49 (b) Omission. your fathers] 69 lectionary 181 reads: our fathers.

6.58 (b) Omission. not as the fathers ate] D Θ Ψ 1250 family 1 family 13 e Majority read: your fathers; 69? lectionary 181 read: our fathers.

8.17: and it is written in your law. There is no textual variant here, but the argument requires that Jesus be appealing to a standard accepted by both him and his opponents. The word *your* looks very like a scribal gloss that has captured the manuscript tradition. Conjecture: our law.

10.34 (b) Omission. is not written in your law] 245 reads: is not written in the law of Moses; p⁴⁵ ✠ D Θ 1170 1242 Old Latin Syriac Sinaiticus Cyprian read: is not written in the law.

15.25 (b) Omission. the word which in their law is written] p^{66*vid} reads: the word which is written; A Θ 065 family 13 and the majority transpose the words, which suggests that they were originally a gloss: the word which is written in their law. Translate: the word that is written.

19.7 (b) Omission. according to our law] p^{66*} ✠ B D^s L N W Δ Ψ Old Latin read: according to the law.

8. But is not the absence of such references to the Jews in the Synoptics a sign of a Johannine editorial tendency?

Acts and John's Gospel are both marked by a tendency to use the expression *The Jews*. Is that not a sign that an editorial hand has been at work? Acts is a separate question, but the contrast between the Fourth Gospel and the other three may have another and a simpler explanation. In the Synoptic Gospels there is relatively little dialectic. When there is controversy, the Synoptic Gospels almost always specify who Jesus' opponents are, using terms like Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, High Priests, Elders, Scribes and the like. It is certain of the scribes who wonder whether Jesus is not blaspheming when he forgives the paralytic (Matt 9.3; Mark 2.6; Luke 5.21); it is Pharisees who raise the question about plucking corn on the sabbath (Matt 12.2; Mark 2.24; Luke 3 6.2); it is Pharisees and scribes who raise the issue of defilement (Matt 15.1; Mark 7.1; Luke 11.37); it is the Pharisees and the Herodians who raise the question of tribute money (Matt 22.15; Mark 12.13; cf. Luke 20.20); and it is the Chief Priests, the Elders and the scribes who hand Jesus over to Pilate

(Matt 27.1; Mark 15.1; Luke 23.1). These specific terms are largely absent from John. John also has a far higher proportion of dialogue, cut and thrust, with plenty of opportunities for a scribe to put in a reference to the Jews because most of the opponents are simply *They*. It is worth noting that in the one reference in Luke to the Jews, Luke 7.3: They sent to him elders of the Jews, Chrysostom does not read *of the Jews*. Even this one reference may well have been a gloss.

However, if the Synoptic Gospels do not provide much scope for a scribe who wanted to insert an antiquarian reference to the Jews, their textual tradition is subject to similar forces. In references to scribes, synagogues, the law and the fathers the little word *their* is often added, suggesting that scribes, synagogues, law and fathers were not the possession also of the first disciples. There is one case in Luke where our better printed texts do not have *their*, but the tendency to add is illustrated by a variant reading 5:21 (their scribes: Γ 16 477 1216 1579).

The evidence for the omission of *their* is as follows:

Matt 7.29 (C* L 265 565 700 1010 1424 Majority); 10.17 (W aur).

Mark 1.23 (L 579 Bohairic); 1.39 (D 4 245 b c ff² t; of the Jews 713 1082 1391).

Luke 4.15 (D a b d l Sahidic^{ms}); 4.29 (579 Bohairic^{mss}); 5.30 (⋈ D F X 118 1215 e d f ff² l Syriac Peshitta Sahidic Bohairic); 6.23 (your: 713 1424 2643 lectionary 158); 6.26 (p^{75vid} B 700* 1241 Syriac Sinaiticus Sahidic; your: 69 472 1009 1192); 22.66 (475 577 1342 lectionary 184); 23.1 (D 063 69 713 903 1242 1424 lectionaries 48 211 292 e Syriac Sinaiticus and Curetonian).

9. Conclusion

All we know of the history of the church would lead us to suppose that anti-Jewish feeling would grow rather than diminish. The synagogue expelled Christians, and Christians became more and more of Gentile origin, liable to share the anti-Jewish sentiments of their compatriots. Marcion formalised tendencies that were already at work.

I have been arguing that the Fourth Gospel was originally a collection of episodes that assumed Jesus and the disciples were faithful Jews caught up in sharp dialogue with their fellow Jews. The

hostile references to Jews, largely encapsulated in the term *The Jews*, for the most part look like scribal glosses rather than integral parts of the original narratives. This exegetical argument is buttressed by an argument drawn from the history of the text of the Fourth Gospel. There are eleven cases above where our printed texts do not give *The Jews*, but where some scribes added the expression. In our printed texts, there are thirteen cases above where there is some manuscript evidence for the omission of the term, and another thirteen cases where the transposition of the term suggests that originally it was a gloss, nearly one third of all examples in our printed texts. The history of the church would not lend much support to the hypothesis that the scribal tendency was to omit hostile references to the Jews, so that we must read the evidence the other way: the scribes tended to add the expression. That conclusion raises the probability that, in the cases where the majority of manuscripts offer us the reading, we are justified in conjecturing that the reading was the result of scribal contamination and that the words did not belong in the earliest copies of the Fourth Gospel. Any theories about John's Gospel that start from a supposed hostility in that Gospel to the Jews as an organised body over against the church are probably based on a series of unfortunate late scribal corruptions.

J. C. O'Neill
University of Edinburgh

THE APOCALYPTIC HOPE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Dr. Hamilton Moore

Most Jewish apocalyptic writings can be dated from the mid-second century B.C. to the second century A.D. Their popularity and general circulation, particularly in the dispersion, bear testimony to the widespread interest in apocalyptic ideas at the time. Jesus, the early Christians, and the New Testament writers stand in the middle of this period or are at least contemporary with it. It is not surprising therefore, to find certain apocalyptic concepts and apocalyptic passages in the New Testament. There has been lively discussion among recent scholars with regard to the influence of Jewish apocalyptic concepts on the earliest Christian writings. A number of questions has been raised. For example, are apocalyptic concepts important, even fundamental in the New Testament or in the teaching of Jesus? Again, was early Christianity characteristically apocalyptic or only incidentally so? Or is it legitimate to speak of early Christian apocalyptic as a separate phenomenon from Jewish apocalyptic and highlight its distinctive features? These are matters which must now be addressed.

Approaches to New Testament Apocalyptic (1900-1960) - A Brief Survey.

At the beginning of the century J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer affirmed that Jesus was deeply influenced by Jewish apocalyptic. His proclamation of the kingdom of God and understanding of his mission were said to be constitutively stamped with the characteristics of apocalyptic.¹ This view was in contrast with the prevailing non-eschatological and spiritual understanding of the kingdom among earlier nineteenth-century Protestant theologians.²

¹ J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, (Göttingen, 1892) [ET., R.H. Heirs and D.L. Holland, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*, (London, 1971)]. A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben - Jesu Forschung*, (1906) [ET., *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*, (3rd Ed. 1954)]. See the final chapter.

² Two examples of the spiritual understanding are Schleiermacher, *Der Christliche Glaube* [ET., H.R. Mackintosh and J.S. Stewart,

Weiss criticized Ritschl's understanding of the kingdom, with its emphasis on the activity of men in building that kingdom, rather than on the activity of God. Instead of being advanced by the work of men, Weiss understood the kingdom as involving the intervention of God as King into history. Contrary to Ritschl he did not see Jesus as intending to make a beginning of something that would develop into a moral organization of humanity, for this suggests a continuity of history in which the coming of Jesus marks the beginning of a new epoch. Rather, for Weiss, Jesus was conscious that he stood at the end of the world and history. What lay ahead was the consummation of all things, when God would be all in all. The background to Jesus' understanding was to be found in the teaching of prophetic and apocalyptic Judaism.

Following Weiss's contribution, Schweitzer gave to Jesus even a greater apocalyptic stamp or interpretation. The kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus was an apocalyptic concept and its coming was expected in the immediate future.³ The ethical teaching of Jesus was only an *Interimsethik*, giving evidence of what was involved in true repentance and applied only to the short time before the kingdom arrived.⁴ According to Schweitzer, Jesus knew himself to be the designated Messiah, the one who would be revealed as the Son of Man when the kingdom came. When this failed to happen Jesus was determined to force its coming. Therefore he went to Jerusalem to his death, seeking to fulfil the messianic woes in his

Christian Faith (1929)]. For Schleiermacher the kingdom of God is the "corporate human God-consciousness, which is the existence of God in human nature and which comes into being as a result of Christ's God-consciousness" (164.1). A.Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (1888) [ET., H.R.Mackintosh and A.B.Macaulay, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, (1902)]. Ritschl criticized Schleiermacher for not having done justice to the "theological nature of the kingdom of God as the Divine end". Arising out of redemption (the other focal point of Christianity) the "kingdom is the moral organization of humanity, through actions inspired by love".

³ Op.cit., p.238

⁴ Ibid., p.352.

own person, thus bringing in the kingdom and with it his manifestation as Son of Man.⁵

In the opinion of many scholars, Schweitzer's work was inferior to that of Weiss, but, because it involved a subject of particular interest at that time, i.e., the life of Christ, interpreting it in apocalyptic terms, it had an impact greater than that of Weiss, who had focussed on the teaching of Jesus. Thus it could not fail to reach a wide public and create an interest to which New Testament scholars must respond. Much of that response was an attempt "to escape from or at least to soften"⁶. Weiss and Schweitzer's presentation of the apocalyptic Jesus.

Perrin outlines the response particularly in the English-speaking world.⁷ While at first many scholars had to bow before the force of Schweitzer's theory, they eventually came to terms with it by affirming that although Jesus had taken over certain elements from contemporary Jewish apocalyptic, he profoundly changed them and gave them a new spiritual meaning.⁸ Subsequently this "transformation of apocalyptic" gave way for a period to the "denial" of apocalyptic⁹ and then the eventual "triumph" of apocalyptic in the 1930's, which involved the recognition of the kingdom of God as an apocalyptic concept in the teaching of Jesus

⁵ Ibid., p.386.

⁶ J.D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, (London, 1977) p. 316.

⁷ N. Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, (London, 1963 pp.33ff.

⁸ Perrin cites as one example, W.Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (1907) and "The Apocalyptic Element in the Gospels", *Hibbert Journal* 10(1911) pp.83-109.

⁹ Perrin makes reference to the "Symposium of Eschatology", written by a representative group of scholars and published in *JBL* 41 (1922) pp 1-204. Contributors were K.Fullerton, N. Schmidt, L.Ginzberg, E.F.Scott and B.W.Bacon. Scott maintained that underlying the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus was a practical religious purpose, which meant more to him than the forms in which he articulated it. The function of the apocalyptic teaching "is to enforce a message which is not apocalyptic... his demand was for a new kind of life, a new relation to God..."p. 138.

and the attempt to go on from there to seek to establish its significance for him.¹⁰ Perrin proceeds to highlight the great influence of one particular scholar in this discussion, namely C.H.Dodd.

Dodd¹¹ maintained that the concept of the kingdom of God was employed by Jesus in different ways.¹² It was used first of all in a way parallel to the usage of the rabbis, i.e., the kingdom of God is realised in human experience by submission to the divine will. Again, the term is found as in prophetic-apocalyptic use, i.e., in an eschatological sense. However, there are sayings which do not fall within either of these frameworks, sayings reflecting the prophetic-apocalyptic use of the kingdom, but with this difference, the 'eschatological' kingdom of God is proclaimed as a present fact which men must recognise, whether by their actions they accept or reject it. It is this last group of sayings which Dodd came to see as Jesus' unique contribution. The emphasis falls on the presence of the

¹⁰ Perrin claims that the "triumph" of apocalyptic can be seen in papers presented to a conference of six English and six German theologians held at Canterbury in 1927, called to discuss the nature of the kingdom of God and its relation to human society. These papers were published in *Theology* 14 (1927) pp.249-95. Among the four scholars who concerned themselves particularly with the New Testament and the teaching of Jesus there was absolute unanimity in regarding the kingdom of God as an apocalyptic concept. One of these scholars was C.H.Dodd who subsequently was to develop this subject in new and exciting ways.

¹¹ The numerous contributions of Dodd on the subject include: "The This-Worldly Kingdom of God in our Lord's Teaching", *Theology* 14 (1927), pp.258-260; "The Gospel Parables", *BJRL* 16, (1932), pp.396-412; *The Parables of the Kingdom* (1935); "The Kingdom of God has come", *Exp.T.*, 48 (1936-7), pp.138-142; *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, (London, 1936), *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (1953) and *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge, 1963).

¹² E.g., *Parables of the Kingdom*, pp.34-44.

kingdom in his own person and ministry, i.e., realized eschatology.¹³ This approach has been very influential in Britain especially, and, according to Tupper¹⁴, much of Anglo-American New Testament exegesis throughout the first half of the century can be summarized as resistance to the thorough-going apocalyptic Jesus of Schweitzer and attraction to the realized eschatology of Dodd.

As far as German New Testament scholarship was concerned, Koch¹⁵ explains that in the years following Weiss and Schweitzer there appears to have been a greater readiness to admit an apocalyptic stamp for Paul and the early church than for Jesus. Around the time of the first world war, apocalyptic ceased to be of topical interest and the rabbinic writings pushed themselves more and more to the fore, in the search for the background to the New Testament. Where the special character of apocalyptic was admitted at all, it was declared to be the esoteric property of the scribes. For Jesus and primitive Christianity the result was a modified prophetic correction theory.¹⁶ Even when in this period salvation history was discovered to be the centre of the New Testament faith, and Jesus

¹³ In later years Dodd hinted at certain modifications to his view, See *The Coming of Christ*, (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 13f. Following J. Jeremias' *The Parables of Jesus*, (London, 1954), Dodd appears to have agreed to the description of the emphasis of Jesus as, "an eschatology that is in process of realization", p. 159. See *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* p. 447, n. 1.

¹⁴ E. F. Tupper, "The Revival of Apocalyptic in Biblical and Theological Studies", *Review and Expositor* Vol. LXXII No 3 (1975), p. 286.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 58f.

¹⁶ Koch explains that this involves Jesus and perhaps even John picking up where the great prophets left off without the influence of the apocalyptists, which was viewed as a disappointingly regressive step. He points out that it is this conviction which lies behind Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, "a work which like no other moulded the understanding of the New Testament for whole generations of theologians and in which apocalyptic is hardly given separate treatment at any point", *ibid.*, p. 60. (There is a difference with articles which appear after 1960).

was seen to be at the centre of time, between creation and the end¹⁷, “no one”, according to Koch, “investigated a relationship to a possible understanding of history on the part of the preceding apocalyptic. On the contrary, importance was attached to the fact that the New Testament view is ‘radically different’ from that of Judaism in its global aspect”.¹⁸

However, among many New Testament scholars who viewed apocalyptic with suspicion and mistrust, there were a few who continued to accept apocalyptic as having an importance of its own for the New Testament and for interpreting Jesus. One such was Bultmann, who was convinced through the earlier work of Weiss, of Jesus’ apocalyptic conception of the coming of the kingdom of God. As Bultmann explains, the expected fulfilment of history in the arrival of the kingdom of God failed to appear. “History did not come to an end, and as every schoolboy knows, it will continue to run its course”.¹⁹ Tupper²⁰ has pointed out that Bultmann’s convictions concerning Jesus’ unfulfilled hope for the eschatological kingdom of God illuminated for him the mythological character of Jesus’ apocalyptic eschatology and the mythical element in the New Testament’s world view. This propelled Bultmann into the programme of demythologising, which attempted to uncover the deeper meaning behind the mythological conceptions of the New Testament, a meaning which called men to decision. Apocalyptic therefore played an important role for Bultmann as far as Jesus and the New Testament was concerned, but in a completely negative way.

Apocalyptic ... The Mother of all Christian Theology

In 1960 Ernst Käsemann published his essay “The Beginnings of Christian Theology”²¹ which helped spark off a

¹⁷ O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, (London,1951).

¹⁸ Op.cit., p.61.

¹⁹ R. Bultmann, “New Testament and Mythology, *Kerygma and Myth* Vol.1 ed. by H.W.Bartsch and translated by R.H. Fuller, (London,1953) p. 5

²⁰ Op.cit. p.288.

²¹ E. Käsemann, “The Beginnings of Christian Theology”, *JTC* 6, (New York,1969) pp.40ff.

revived interest in apocalyptic.²² According to Käsemann, Jesus' ministry was bracketed between the apocalyptic expectations of John the Baptist on the one hand and the eschatological hopes of the early Christians on the other; but while taking his start from the apocalyptically determined message of John, Jesus' own preaching "was not constitutively stamped by apocalyptic, but proclaimed the immediate nearness of God".²³ The apocalyptic statements on the lips of Jesus in the Synoptics reflect the reversion to apocalyptic by the early Christians, under the influence of the Easter-event and the coming of the Spirit. Therefore, "Apocalyptic - since the preaching of Jesus cannot really be described as theology - was the mother of all Christian theology".²⁴ In arriving at this position Käsemann focused his attention on certain texts in Matthew's gospel, and here found evidence of a vigorous Jewish-Christian group within the early church, led by prophets and marked by strong apocalyptic traits.²⁵ He claimed, "We block our own access to the earliest Easter kerygma if we disregard its apocalyptic context",²⁶ and concludes, "My own claim is that post-Easter apocalyptic is the oldest variation and interpretation of the kerygma".²⁷

²² See Koch, op.cit. p.40.

²³ Ibid. p.40

²⁴ Ibid. p.40.

²⁵ See Travis, *Christian Hope and the Future of Man*, (Leicester,1980), p.42ff. Travis has helpfully summarized these as follows: (1) A theology of history which sees the history of salvation and the history of damnation running parallel to each other, and which divides history into "clearly distinguishable epochs". (2) Ethical exhortations which appeal to an eschatological *ius talionis* (i.e., the principle of "an eye for an eye"). (3) Expectation of a transformation of values in the last days. (4) Re-establishment of the twelve tribes at the parousia. (5) Confirmation of the Mosaic law and opposition to the Gentile mission. (6) Hope of the epiphany of the Son of Man coming to His enthronement and near expectation of the parousia.

²⁶ "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic" *JTC* 6 (1969) p. 106

²⁷ Ibid. p.107 n.5.

What of this 'oldest form' and 'variation' as time passed? Käsemann²⁸ claimed the the apocalyptic theology collapsed when the expected parousia failed to happen, and as Christianity spread beyond Palestine, Hellenistic enthusiasm so transformed apocalyptic that it abandoned any kind of future hope. For example, the Corinthian enthusiasts with whom Paul contends believed that the goal of redemption had already been reached with baptism and the redeemed were already risen and enthroned with Christ in heavenly existence. An expectation of the parousia was meaningless, because everything that apocalyptic still hoped for appeared to them to have been realized. According to Käsemann, Paul represents a mid-point between post-Easter apocalyptic and Hellenistic enthusiasm. The apostle sought to maintain a futurist eschatology and his anti-enthusiastic battle was "in the last and deepest analysis fought out under the banner of apocalyptic".²⁹ Paul understands that those who are Christians, "already deliver over to Christ in bodily obedience the piece of world which they themselves are, they testify to his lordship as that of the cosmocrator and thereby provide an anticipatory sign of the ultimate future, of the reality of the resurrection and the unrestricted *regnum Christi*".³⁰ Käsemann maintained that even Paul's central doctrine of justification was derived from apocalyptic, for ultimately it is concerned with the rule of God and his triumph in the world. "Pauline eschatology ... centres round the question whether God is indeed God and when He will fully assert himself as such. (Pauline theology) proclaims the sovereignty of God in apocalyptic".³¹

So Käsemann argued that Christian theology was profoundly indebted to post-Easter apocalyptic. At its centre was the hope of the epiphany of the Son of Man coming to his enthronement, and he maintained "it is a question whether Christian theology can ever

²⁸ Ibid. p.119.

²⁹ Ibid. p.127.

³⁰ Ibid. p.133.

³¹ "An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology", *Essays on New Testament Themes*, (London,1964), p.182.

make do or be legitimate without this motive, which arose from the expectation of Easter and determined Easter faith".³²

Response to Käsemann.

Käsemann's understanding aroused a great deal of attention and debate. As Koch has explained,

"Up to then apocalyptic had been for biblical scholarship something on the periphery of the Old and New Testament - something bordering on heresy. Käsemann had suddenly declared that a tributary was the main stream, from which everything else at the end of the Old Testament and the beginning of the New was allegedly fed".³³

It is important to note some of the early criticisms which were made of Käsemann's view. Ebeling,³⁴ in a critique published a year after Käsemann, claimed that if primitive Christianity was as indebted to Jewish apocalyptic as Käsemann maintains, it is surprising that the Christian production of apocalypses was a late development. "It is no accident that the characteristic literary form of Christianity was the gospel and not the apocalypse".³⁵ In his view, Käsemann has not taken enough account of the way apocalyptic ideas have themselves been changed through their link with Jesus. We should not "merely interpret Jesus in the light of apocalyptic, but also and above all interpret apocalyptic in the light of Jesus".³⁶ In addition, how could the supposedly non-apocalyptic preaching of Jesus be followed by the apocalyptic preaching of the early church, as a response to his life and message? Again, Fuchs maintains that Käsemann has minimised the element of 'realized' eschatology in primitive Christianity³⁷ and Conzelmann claims that theology has always to do with concrete sober doctrine and not with the apocalyptic enthusiasm, which Käsemann ascribes to the

³² *JTC* 6, p.46.

³³ *Op.cit.* p.14.

³⁴ G. Ebeling, "The Ground of Christian Theology", in *JTC* 6, (New York,1969), pp.47ff.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p.53

³⁶ *Ibid.*,p.58.

³⁷ E. Fuchs, "On the Task of a Christian Theology", *JTC* 6, (New York,1969).

members of the primitive church. Conzelmann finds a lack of evidence for this enthusiasm in the texts. Instead, he finds credal formulations like the ancient tradition in 1Cor.15, which clearly pass on the faith in the form of doctrine. "These, not apocalyptic fantasies or spiritual experience... are the well-spring of Christian theology".³⁸

Finally, in an important article, Rollins³⁹ maintains that Käsemann's use of texts from Matthew is arbitrary. Nowhere does he really justify his claim that these texts reflect a theological tension existing in the early church. Evidence e.g., from 1Cor.15 suggests that the earliest forms of the kerygma were not concerned with apocalyptic concepts like Son of Man or parousia. For Rollins, even if the texts cited by Käsemann indicate the existence of an apocalyptic 'strand' or apocalyptic groups in the primitive church, they do not mean that apocalyptic was the controlling theological emphasis of the earliest church. It was "not the mother of all Christian theology, but at best one of many brothers, whose particular brand of theology would have stood in obvious tension with the teaching of Jesus and the theology of the earliest church".⁴⁰ Using another metaphor, Rollins suggests that apocalyptic was not mother but midwife. The Christ-event itself was what produced the theologies of the first Christians. Jewish apocalyptic supplied only the mode through which the Christ-event was conceptualized.⁴¹ Furthermore, by proclaiming Jesus as the expected Messiah the church reclaimed history and the world as the realm of God's self-disclosure, thus displacing the pessimism of Jewish apocalypticism, which considered God as absent from history during this evil age. Rollins interprets this as "a tacit rejection of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology and a return to prophetic *Heilsgeschichte*".⁴² From its earliest beginnings Rollins sees the church as opposed to apocalyptic. We should not be surprised to find apocalyptic material in the New

³⁸ H. Conzelmann, "Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel I Cor.15:3-5", *Ev.Th.* 25 (1965) p.9.

³⁹ W.G.Rollins, "The New Testament and Apocalyptic", *NTS* 17 (1970 1971) pp. 454ff.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.468.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.472.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p.473.

Testament, but should note that we find so little of it. Even within the apocalyptic sections there are some 'anti-apocalyptic elements' such as the rejection of the calculation of the end by means of signs (Mk.13:32; Lk.17:20f). Therefore Rollins claims, "one can speak of the apocalypticism of the New Testament only with extreme caution".⁴³

Criticisms like these are impressive and must be given serious consideration. Yet we may still feel that apocalyptic has a more influential place in early Christianity than some of these scholars are willing to allow. Recent works on Judaism and Jewish background⁴⁴ have lent support to the view that apocalyptic was highly influential in the intertestamental and early New Testament period. If it had such a place at the turn of the century, it is difficult to isolate the early Christians or even Jesus from it. Most scholars would agree that Jesus understood himself within the prophetic tradition. If apocalyptic can be said to find its roots and be an heir to prophecy, as Hanson has maintained,⁴⁵ the possibility of Jesus identifying himself with the prophetic-apocalyptic expectations proves viable. The situation appears to be as Audet has explained, "Le problème n'est donc pas de se demander s'il y a eu influence, mais d'essayer d'apprécier l'importance et les limites de cette influence".⁴⁶

Both Käsemann's arguments and that of his critics betray certain weaknesses. For Travis, Käsemann's position is weak when he presents a non-apocalyptic Jesus, sandwiched between an apocalyptically fired John the Baptist and early church. "It is hard to

⁴³ Ibid., p.475.

⁴⁴ E.g., see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, (London, 1974), pp.252-254. He surveys the development of Jewish thought in the controversy with the Hellenistic spirit of the time. While there are gaps in our knowledge, he believes it probable that between the Maccabean revolt and the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D.70, the piety of Palestinian Judaism was shaped to a considerable extent by apocalyptic expectation of the end.

⁴⁵ See P.D.Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, (Philadelphia, 1975).

⁴⁶ L. Audet, "L'influence de l'apocalyptique sur les pensées de Jésus et de l'Eglise primitive", *Science et Esprit*, XXV, (1973), p.

imagine anything more improbable”.⁴⁷ There are other scholars who find numerous apocalyptic features in Jesus’ teaching. For example, Dunn⁴⁸ discusses the following: (a) Jesus, like the apocalyptists, saw the present age as deeply influenced by demonic powers. (b) He probably used the language of the two ages (e.g. Mk.3:29; 10:30). The discontinuity between the two ages is marked in various ways, particularly by the fact that the final judgment will mark the beginning of the age of the kingdom (Mt.19:28). (c) Jesus anticipated the time of eschatological trial prior to the end (e.g., Mt.5:11f; 6:13). Dunn believes that Jesus probably saw his own death as part of the sufferings that would precede the coming of the kingdom (Mk.3:22-25), and the resurrection as part of the beginning of the resurrection of the dead in ushering in the new age. (d) Jesus seems to have thought of the end as imminent (e.g., Mk.1:15, 9:1,13:30), for Dunn, within the lifetime of his own generation, before the disciples had completed the round of preaching to Israel (Mt.10:23). (e) He probably saw the climax of the end events as the coming from heaven of (himself as) the Son of Man, deliberately echoing the apocalyptic language of Dan.7 (e.g., Mk.8:38). (f) Jesus’ technical term ‘the kingdom of God’ underlines the belief both in its transcendent character and in God’s sovereign control of events leading to its full establishment. Dunn claims that even if questions are raised by some scholars about the authenticity of a number of Jesus’ sayings, it appears that many of them express ideas which are widespread, deep-rooted and “pervasive in the Jesus tradition”. He therefore finds it difficult to avoid the conclusion that apocalyptic ideas were vitally important for Jesus’ understanding of his message and that his vision of the future kingdom was apocalyptic in character.⁴⁹

Dunn does see two features which mark off Jesus’ apocalypticism from contemporary apocalyptic. First of all, there is a cautionary note in his teaching about the future. Jesus seems to have contemplated an interval of time before the end, during which several decisive events had still to take place, i.e., his own death and vindication, his disciples’ final appeal to Israel, their persecution

⁴⁷ *Christian Hope*, p.47.

⁴⁸ *Op.cit.*, pp.318ff.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p.321.

and end-time tribulation. Also he did not follow typical apocalyptic practice in drawing up a calendar of the end. Secondly, there is a clear note of realized eschatology in Jesus' teaching. The eschatological kingdom is in some sense already present and active in and through his ministry and this forms a decisive break with the apocalypticism of his time. Dunn explains that this note of realized eschatology was what led Käsemann to place Jesus wholly apart from the framework of apocalyptic thought. Käsemann considered this so much the distinctive feature of Jesus' teaching that the passages in the Synoptic tradition which speak of an imminent end belong not to the message of Jesus, but to the preaching of the primitive Christian community, when in post-Easter enthusiasm they resorted again to apocalyptic terms. Dunn's conviction is that Käsemann has over-stated his case. He has failed to grasp the nature of the present-future tension in Jesus' preaching. "The 'immediate nearness of God' is not something other than the presence of the kingdom in eschatological blessing, and the presence of the kingdom was precisely the end-time power already entering the present age and prestaging the imminent coming of the kingdom in eschatological finality".⁵⁰

There are some controversial points in Dunn's presentation of an apocalyptic Jesus, and the picture will need to be tempered somewhat later, but his view of an apocalyptic emphasis in Jesus' preaching and his criticisms of Käsemann appear to be convincing. Not only is Käsemann's position weak, but the position of his critics in certain respects is weak also. For example, Rollins referred to the sense of the meaninglessness of history in Jewish apocalyptic which he then contrasted with the positive evaluation of history and of the world which one finds in the early church's realized eschatology. Travis is helpful here when he maintains that the method of unfavourably comparing apocalyptic with Old Testament prophecy on the one hand and New Testament realized eschatology on the other, misconstrues the true relationship between them. What Rollins calls the 'post-apocalypticism' of the New Testament "does not arise from a rejection of apocalyptic and a reversion to a prophetic attitude, but rather from a recognition that the expectation

of the apocalyptists have begun to find their fulfilment in Jesus”⁵¹. Support for this viewpoint is outlined in a separate article by Travis on apocalyptic⁵² and the following examples are given: (a) Whilst it would be linguistically impossible for Jesus to say that ‘the age to come’ had already dawned, he does say that about his equivalent phrase, ‘kingdom of God’. “If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons then the kingdom of God has come upon you” (Mt.12 :28). In a host of images he declares that the salvation of the new age is already available. Jesus’ disciples see what prophets and kings long to see. (b) Although Jesus saw people as subject to the power of Satan, he also declared that his coming meant the beginning of victory over Satan (Mt.12:28; Mk.3:22-27). The single reference to what looks like an apocalyptic vision experienced by Jesus, is a vision about this victory (Lk.10:18). Thus, Jesus’ ability to take a less pessimistic view of the present course of history was not due to a rejection of apocalyptic and a reversion to the prophetic attitude. It arises from the conviction that in him apocalyptic hopes are reaching fulfilment. His world-affirming attitude is motivated by his sense that the eschatological time of salvation has dawned. His table-fellowship anticipates the messianic banquet. (c) His ministry to Gentiles, despite his declaration that the primary target of his mission is Israel, is another indication that the eschatological time of salvation has begun to find fulfilment (Mk.7:24-30; Mt.8:5-13). (d) His self-designation as Son of Man brings into focus his acceptance of apocalyptic hopes and his conviction that those hopes were entering the stage of fulfilment through his own mission of suffering, which would lead to vindication by God (following the pattern of Dan.7). For Travis therefore, as for Dunn, the basic structure of Jesus’ thinking owes much to Jewish apocalyptic, more than either Käsemann or many of his critics allow.

Going on from Jesus, Dunn looks at the primitive Christian community and finds here also a high degree of apocalyptic fervency.⁵³ Firstly, they found it necessary to use the apocalyptic category of resurrection to express their new faith. They believed

⁵¹ *Christian Hope*, p.49.

⁵² “The Value of Apocalyptic”, *TynB* 30. (1979). pp.69ff.

⁵³ *Op.cit.*, pp.322ff.

that they stood in 'the last days', leading up to the last day as predicted by Joel (Acts 2:17f; Joel 2:28-32), and Jesus resurrection was the beginning of the resurrection of the dead (Rom.1:3f; ICor.15:20,23; cf.Mt.27:52f). They were the eschatological Israel, the people of the new covenant, inaugurated by the death and resurrection of Jesus (Mk.14:27-25 and parallels; ICor.11:23ff); their representatives 'the twelve', reconstituted with the election of Matthias in Judas' place (Acts.1:15-26), would soon take up their role as judges of Israel in the final judgment itself (cf. Mt. 19:28/Lk. 22:29). Evidently, too, they lived in daily expectation of the parousia of Jesus (Acts 3:17-21).⁵⁴ Finally, their common life revolved around the temple, expressing the hope of eschatological renewal centred on Mt. Zion, with a renewed or rebuilt temple. For Dunn this is the significance attached to Jesus 'cleansing of the temple' (Mk.11:17) and why during the first few months they did not stir from Jerusalem. So Dunn maintains, "In short, the perspective of the earliest Christian church(es) seems to have been very narrow indeed: they were already in the last days leading up to the last day, they stood in the final climactic period of history, at the edge of the end, the final swing of the pendulum had already begun... the cautionary note also present in Jesus' teaching seems to have been almost wholly swamped by the apocalyptic fervour for the imminent end".⁵⁵

In the light of this analysis of the earliest church, Dunn sees Christianity begun as an apocalyptic sect within Judaism, a sect which in its apocalypticism was in substantial continuity with the message both of John the Baptist and of Jesus. Thus he concludes, "Since this is where Christianity all began, to that extent Käsemann is correct, apocalyptic was 'the mother of all Christian theology'".⁵⁶

Finally, in his survey Dunn turns his attention to the apocalyptic literature of the New Testament. It occasions no surprise for him that I and II Thessalonians (probably the earliest New Testament documents) are distinctly ,while not entirely,

⁵⁴ Dunn maintains that it is within the context of eschatological enthusiasm that we have to understand the so-called 'community of goods'. (Acts.2:44f;4:32-37).

⁵⁵ Ibid., p.324.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p.325.

apocalyptic in tone and content. The expectation of the imminent parousia was a prominent feature (I Thess.1:9,4:15,17,5:23) and this is described in explicitly apocalyptic language, "as a descending from heaven, with archangels and clouds, with loud shouts and trumpet blasts and the resurrection of the dead".⁵⁷ It would come without warning, bringing destruction for the unprepared, sudden and terrible, the birth-pangs of the new age "and there will be no escape" (I Thess.5:2f). Thus apocalyptic was an integral part of the early Christian expansion beyond the confines of Palestine.⁵⁸ Dunn also sees II Thessalonians as Pauline. Here again Paul reaffirms his expectations of an imminent parousia and paints it in apocalyptic colours (II Thess.1:4-10). In ch.2:1-12 one sees the strong influence of classical Jewish apocalyptic imagery in the concept ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας,⁵⁹ and in the desecration of the temple (cf. Dan.9:27, 11:31,12:11; Macc.1:54). "Here then is Christian apocalyptic already spread into Europe, but still depicting the final rebellion in terms of the Jerusalem temple".⁶⁰ Dunn particularly notes the esoteric nature of the passage; ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, τὸ κατέχον and ὁ κατέχων are deliberately veiled references - a typically apocalyptic stylistic feature. Thus we have Christian documents almost twenty years after Christ, with the Gentile mission already well under way, in which the hope of an imminent end still burns brightly and is expressed in language and imagery typical of Jewish apocalyptic. However, it is clear that distinctively Christian features are present, i.e., the divine agent who will bring in the end is Jesus, and the cautionary note in Jesus' preaching also reoccurs (τὸ κατέχον is

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.325.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.326.

⁵⁹ Dunn claims this concept "comes straight out of Jewish apocalyptic, where the eschatological opposition to God was often represented by a single figure - Satan or a dragon, or in human form as a tyrant or prophet hostile to God" p.327. (See *Sib Or.* III63-70). Dunn asks us to notice that the man of lawlessness is not, properly speaking, an anti-Christ figure but one who opposes God. Here Christian thought has taken over the Jewish concept, but has not yet developed it into the more distinctly Christian idea of Antichrist.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p.327.

still operative). Paul however, has not met the Thessalonian 'abuse of apocalyptic' by abandoning apocalyptic but simply by spelling out the apocalyptic hope more fully. "At this stage anyway (nearly twenty years after his conversion) apocalyptic remained an integral part of his message and hope".⁶¹

For Dunn, Mark 13 also, however it found its form⁶² is marked by typical apocalyptic elements⁶³. Mark evidently saw the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple as part of the messianic woes, the beginning of the end. Again for Dunn, after the fall of Jerusalem, when Luke relates the eschatological discourse, he does not abandon the apocalyptic expectation, but separates a single complex of events, (the destruction of Jerusalem and the parousia), claiming for the first a fulfilment in A.D.70 and reaffirming the apocalyptic hope afresh.

Revelation for Dunn, obviously stands within the tradition of apocalyptic literature with its cosmic dualism, visions and fantastic imagery. John is writing against the backcloth of mounting persecution, which he believed was building up to the final climax of evil and tribulation. Thus, "how little the fires of apocalyptic expectancy have faded in the latter decades of the first century".⁶⁴

⁶¹ Ibid., p.328.

⁶² Some have seen a Jewish document, namely a 'Little Apocalypse' lying behind the eschatological discourse.

⁶³ These include: συντελεῖσθαι (v4). Its equivalent noun phrase συντελείας (τοῦ αἰῶνος) in Mt.24:3 is a technical term in apocalyptic, particularly in Daniel and Test. of the Twelve to denote the end; world-wide turmoil, wars and natural disasters (vs7-8); the beginning of the birth-pangs of the new age, i.e., the messianic woes; persecution, including the characteristic apocalyptic foreboding of internecine family strife (vs9-13); the esoteric sign, the desolating sacrilege (v14); the urgency and unprecedented anguish of the final tribulation (vs14-20); the cosmic dimensions of the messianic woes, the whole of creation in labour to bring the new age to birth, including the coming of the Son of Man (vs24-27); the imminence of these events of the end, "at the very gates", (vs28-30).

⁶⁴ Op.cit., p.335.

In the light of all this evidence, Dunn is convinced that no one can dispute the fact that apocalyptic had an integral part in first century Christianity, and as fundamental a part in its diversity as the Christianity of Matthew and James, or the Christianity of Corinth and John. Therefore, he finds himself once again at this point in agreement with Käsemann that to seek to remove apocalyptic is to distort the historical reality of Christianity's beginnings.⁶⁵

Apocalyptic in the New Testament-Its Characteristics

How are we to assess the influence of apocalyptic in the New Testament and particularly the picture of an apocalyptic Jesus and an apocalyptic early church which Dunn and to some extent Travis have given us? Firstly, concerning Dunn's claim that Jesus probably thought the end was imminent, within the lifetime of his own generation. Dunn dismisses too easily the counter emphasis of Mk.13:10 with the claim that it "is about as clear an example of an interpretative addition in the light of a changed perspective as we could expect to find in the Synoptic tradition".⁶⁶ The problem of imminence in the message of Jesus is the problem which is found right throughout biblical prophecy and biblical apocalyptic. For Jesus there was an element of unknowability and therefore of uncertainty about the end (Mk.13:32). Since it was clear that God could shorten the period of eschatological distress (Mk.13:30; Lk.18:7f), it was also conceivable that he could lengthen the time of respite, the final period of grace, the last opportunity to repent (Lk.13:6-9).

One necessary modification to the stark presentation of an apocalyptic Jesus given to us by Dunn, is to remember that apocalyptic thought was not the only background to the teaching and mission of Jesus. There are many elements from other currents.⁶⁷ In his teaching for example, one finds elements from the wisdom tradition of Judaism. Some of his teaching reflects the style and interests of the rabbis, some the popular pietism of Palestine. All of

⁶⁵ Ibid., p.335.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p.335.

⁶⁷ See Travis, "The Value of Apocalyptic", p.69, Audet, op. Cit., p. 64.

it is pervaded by the influence of many parts of Scripture, including particularly the Psalms and Deuteronomy. Even Travis makes the point that when Jesus took up apocalyptic he did not simply take it over unchanged but often modified it and charged it with new meaning.⁶⁸

It also should be acknowledged that when we talk about New Testament apocalyptic, we are affirming not only its continuity with Jewish apocalyptic, but also the fact that it is something new. From a history of religions point of view, apparently no such phenomenon as early Christian apocalyptic exists, but all the early Christian apocalyptic texts are considered to be expressions of Jewish apocalyptic and not therefore constitutive of an independent phenomenon which is recognised as 'early Christian apocalyptic'. Often this has led to the adoption of 'husk theories', which involved the attempt to distinguish between the apocalyptic form and spiritual content, the cultural expression and the abiding message, as scholars have attempted to distil 'the essence' from the sociological setting and language. It was Betz⁶⁹ who challenged this research consensus of lumping together Jewish and Christian apocalyptic, by demanding that both should be "seen and presented as peculiar expressions within the entire development of Hellenistic syncretism", and that "Christian apocalypticism is doubtless something new compared with Jewish apocalypticism and it is the new which needs to be determined".⁷⁰

Faced with Betz's challenge and the presentation of apocalyptic in Jesus and the primitive church by Dunn already in this chapter, what are the distinctive features of Christian apocalyptic when compared with Jewish apocalypticism?

First of all, it is clear that in the New Testament the use of Jewish apocalyptic literature and apocalyptic language is restrained. In the gospels and letters of Paul there is not a single quotation from the non-canonical books, and in the rest of the New Testament only in the brief letter of Jude (:14-15; cf., I En.1:9). In addition, writings

⁶⁸ Ibid., p.70.

⁶⁹ H.D.Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism" *JTC* 6 (1969), pp. 134ff.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p.156.

with a marked apocalyptic identity are significantly few in number and even the few sizeable contributions (Mk.13 and parallels; I Thess.4:13-5:11; II Thess.2:1-12) outside the Book of the Revelation have marked differences when compared with other contemporary apocalyptic works. The various works in the New Testament also reflect an authorship which is steeped in, and recognizes the authority of, the books of the Old Testament, rather than the apocalyptic writings.⁷¹ Ebeling's assessment appears to be sound when he insists that what we have in the New Testament is "not apocalyptic systems of ideas, but individual sayings with an apocalyptic background, not a disclosure of apocalyptic mysteries, but concrete, apocalyptically grounded instructions for the present, not a code language of dreams and visions, but one that is universally understandable".⁷² This is demonstrated clearly, for example, in the Marcan eschatological discourse where, although Dunn can list typical apocalyptic elements, apocalyptic actually serves a paraenetic purpose. Cranfield claims that the discourse is in fact "exhortative more than revelatory" and "its purpose is not to impart esoteric information but to sustain faith and obedience".⁷³ Again, as far as Paul is concerned, although the apostle was, as Dunn stressed, clearly influenced by the apocalyptic current, he was very reticent towards apocalyptic speculations. Moreover, he has transformed several apocalyptic schemata into a soteriology where realised eschatology holds an important place.⁷⁴ Certainly Paul has used several apocalyptic expressions or concepts, particularly in his description of the eschatological crisis. It is no less certain, on the other hand, that he has reduced the apocalyptic material. What really matters for Paul is not the place of the parousia, not the circumstances, not the cosmic phenomena, but the assurance that all, living or dead, "will be with the Lord forever" (I Thess.4:14-17). Paul is not interested in elaborating an apocalypse. He uses the

⁷¹ Cf. T.F. Glasson, "What is Apocalyptic?", *NTS*, 27 (1980) pp.98-105.

⁷² *Op.cit.*, p.53.

⁷³ C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge, 1963), p.388.

⁷⁴ See Audet, *op.cit.*, pp. 69ff.

apocalyptic schema for Christological, soteriological or pastoral purposes. Furthermore, faced with apocalyptic enthusiasm in several primitive communities, Paul played a role of control and of orientation, in the simplification and purification of apocalyptic material. He has endeavoured to keep the Christian faith in its original purity with, at its core, the capital event of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is clear that in Paul's writings, the resurrection of Christ is seen in an apocalyptic way in some occurrences, i.e., it pledges the general resurrection. But this is not the only interpretation. In many texts, the resurrection is related to the present Christian life. The Christian life appears as a mystical participation in the death-resurrection of Christ. Other texts present the resurrection as the foundation of the presence of Christ in the community. Thus apocalyptic was for Paul a means, among many others, which he used to express one side of the mystery of the resurrection of Christ.

Morris⁷⁵ explains that it is not surprising that we do not find apocalyptic dominant in the New Testament. In the apocalyptic literature the emphasis is always on the last judgment and the events associated with it. Where the New Testament authors were concerned about the last things, they used apocalyptic vividly and forcefully. But these concerns are not the whole of Christianity. The really central thing for Christians, the 'crucial' thing, is the cross and what Christ has done for man's salvation. Therefore at the heart of Christianity is the gospel, the good news of forgiveness and salvation from sin. As Morris maintains, "The apocalyptists were not proclaiming a gospel. Their only interest in guilty men was that they should be punished. They divided all mankind into the good and the bad. The good, they thought, God would vindicate and deliver from the oppression of their enemies. The bad He would overthrow and utterly destroy... The dominant idea (in apocalyptic) was that God would save good men from trouble, not that He will save bad men from sin".⁷⁶ He concludes, "Since Christ's atoning work is the central doctrine of New Testament Christianity, apocalyptic fails us

⁷⁵ Morris, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 96ff.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

at the heart of the faith... At base Christianity is the gospel. And 'Gospel' is not an apocalyptic term".⁷⁷

The second feature of New Testament apocalyptic to be noted is that the Jewish apocalyptic world-view has undoubtedly been modified, even, it could be claimed, transformed. The apocalyptic hope looked for vindication and deliverance at the last day. But the kingdom, which the apocalyptists looked for at the end of the age, is proclaimed as already present and active in Jesus' person and work, even if its total realisation is still future. In Matt.12:28/Lk.11:20, the kingdom of God is said to have ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. The kingly and saving power of God has drawn near to the hearers and is there for them to grasp, the proof being that its power has been evidenced in the lives of others, i.e., in the exorcisms.⁷⁸ It is also so present that it can be "taken away" by God from Israel and given to another nation who will produce its fruits (Mt.21:43). Again, in Mt.11:12/Lk.16:16 it is claimed that the kingdom "suffers violence". It is uncertain whether this means the kingdom itself suffers violence, or the kingdom comes violently. Marshall opts for the second, i.e., the powerful coming of the kingdom and the effort required to enter it.⁷⁹ Whatever view is accepted, there can be no doubt that the kingdom is considered to be present. Again, in Lk.17:20-21 the kingdom is said to be ἐντὸς ὑμῶν. ἐντὸς is a rare word, which probably here means "in the midst" - present among men and within their grasp.⁸⁰ As Audet has claimed, this juxtaposition of present and future breaks the apocalyptic schema of the two aeons or ages.⁸¹ Jesus also, in the emphasis of his preaching, changed the meaning of the waiting for the eschatological kingdom. It is a time of conversion, which is itself the means of entry into the kingdom.

As far as the primitive church and the first preachers of the kerygma are concerned, while it is now clear that the resurrection of the dead drew its origins from the apocalyptic tradition, as Dunn

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 101.

⁷⁸ I.H.Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, (Exeter, 1978), p. 476.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 629.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.655.

⁸¹ Op.cit., p.58.

maintained, by Jesus' time it was already diffused outside apocalyptic circles in most of the Jewish population, the Sadducees excepted. Therefore, in announcing that God raised Jesus from the dead, the first preachers were not necessarily reflecting the apocalyptic tradition; they were rather situated in the general circle of the eschatology of the time. However, by proclaiming not only the resurrection, but also the death of Jesus as the central point of the Christian gospel, the first preachers separated themselves from the general scheme of the apocalyptic waiting. To announce that a crucified man had become the Lord and Saviour of humanity, was, in a sense, to break the apocalyptic hope.⁸² We should also remember the note of realized eschatology in Paul. Christians are presented as already part of the new creation (II Cor.5:7) and share in the blessings of the age to come, i.e., eternal life, justification and the gift of the Spirit. The reference to the man of sin sitting in the temple (II Thess.2:4), which Dunn claims is to be taken literally, may rather be a case of an apocalyptic theme which Paul has taken over, intending it to be interpreted as a symbol of opposition to God, or the assumption of authority over God's people.⁸³ In conclusion, it is clear that primitive Christianity never became imprisoned in any current of thought of its time. Having its own originality and conscious of the richness of the mystery it was announcing, it went its own way.

A third feature of the New Testament apocalyptic hope is that it is also Christ-centred. Here we do find ourselves in full agreement with Dunn, when he asserts that it is not only the realized character Jesus stamped on Jewish apocalyptic, but also his centrality, which distinguishes Christian apocalyptic from its Jewish counterpart. While often the hope of Jewish apocalyptic was undefined, or had to be left to purely symbolic language, the Christian apocalyptic hope crystallized round a particular man already encountered in history. That hope came to classical expression in the expectation of the parousia of the Jesus now

⁸² Ibid., p.67.

⁸³ For a discussion of the various possibilities see E.Best, *Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, (London, 1972), pp. 286-287.

exalted. We should note also that the apocalyptic blessings, since they are received 'in Christ', are also church-orientated. They are fulfilled among the New People of God, both Israelites and Gentiles who believe.

Fourthly, it should be noted that in the New Testament apocalyptic imagery is ennobled and enriched. Sometimes the Jewish apocalyptists expressed themselves crudely, engaged in unfruitful speculation, or adopted attitudes unworthy of the worshippers of the God of Israel. Jesus has taken elements from the apocalyptists which were of value and filled them with positive theological significance. Terms like 'kingdom of God' and 'Son of Man' have been taken up creatively and given a new and richer content. France points out, "His kingdom-language was a launching pad from which he has taken off to explore new ideas and conclusions which his Jewish counterparts would not have thought of and to which their traditional understanding of the phrase would have presented some resistance".⁸⁴ The title Son of Man was apparently not yet a current Messianic title. Therefore Jesus could use it without being liable to be misunderstood and even to fuse it with the prophecies of the Suffering Servant of The Lord (Mk.8:31, 9:12, 10:33).

Finally, it must be acknowledged that although there is a uniqueness about New Testament apocalyptic when compared with its Jewish counterpart, yet the apocalyptic hope is still retained in the New Testament. It appears that apocalyptic thought has been the foundation of a certain current of thought in the primitive church, which used some of the apocalyptic material, particularly when they wished to talk about the future and the Christian hope. Jewish apocalyptic has brought a conceptualisation to the Christ-event, in line with that hope. While it is clear that the Jewish apocalyptic outlook has been transformed or modified, we must again, with Travis, reaffirm that all these modifications are not because of the rejection of apocalyptic but rather through a sense of present, if yet partial, fulfilment. Therefore, it is not correct, as some scholars have done, just to ascribe to apocalyptic simply a negative role in the New

⁸⁴

R.T.France "The Church and the Kingdom of God", in *Biblical Interpretation and the Church*, Ed. D.A.Carson, (Exeter, 1984), p. 36.

Testament. For example, in Mark's eschatological discourse, the evangelist certainly is concerned, not to encourage apocalyptic speculation and excitement, but to suppress it. One remembers the type of thinking mentioned in Lk.19:11, where, as Jesus drew near to Jerusalem, there were some who "supposed that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately". As Hooker has claimed, the message is, "Do not get overexcited, the end is near, but not as near as all that".⁸⁵ However, while apocalyptic excitement is suppressed, we must recognise that the ultimate fulfilment of the apocalyptic hope is not denied. It can be affirmed that the coming of the kingdom in Jesus has only set in motion the process of fulfilment on which the apocalyptic hope is set.

In conclusion, it is obvious that apocalyptic has had a profound influence on the New Testament message. Primitive Christianity did use modes of expression in keeping with the cultural and religious milieu of its time, but not without modifying very often the content of that expression, in order to express better its new faith and personal experience. To articulate its hope and its confidence in the future, the primitive community, as Dunn claimed, did often use the elements of the apocalyptic tradition. But, as Audet⁸⁶ has maintained, it was never impressed by the 'fever' of the future, nor by the utopia of big dreams, nor by the flight from the realities of this present world. If the waiting for the parousia has constituted one pole of the Christian hope, the event of the death-resurrection of Christ has constituted another pole. But the 'already' of the salvation brought by the death-resurrection of Jesus is the guarantee of the 'not yet', to be entirely revealed at the parousia of Christ. Therefore,

⁸⁵ M.D.Hooker, "Trial and Tribulation in Mark 13", *BJRL*, Vol. 65 (1982), pp. 78ff. Also, concerning Matt.24, see D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, (London.1972), p. 318.

⁸⁶ *Op.cit.*, p. 73.

Moore, **The Apocalyptic Hope**, *IBS* 18 April 1996

because it had an apocalyptic tone, the Christian hope is orientated towards the future, towards the Lord who will realise a full eschatological fulfilment.

Dr Hamilton Moore

How to Read Karl Barth. The Shape of his Theology, by George Hunsinger. Article Review by John Thompson
Oxford University Press, 1991, £24.00

This excellent book by Prof George Hunsinger, currently working at the Research Institute in Princeton, is the fruit of fifteen years study of the *Church Dogmatics*. It claims to give a new reading of the methodology of Karl Barth's work. It is marked by a thorough knowledge of Barth, a deep appreciation of his great contribution to theology and a study which confines itself exclusively to the *Church Dogmatics*. It does not attempt to offer any critique of Barth's work but only minor suggestions for clarification. Any critique would have to be a separate study. The fact that it deals with methodology means that there is less of the content of the *Dogmatics* given than one would normally expect.

The author clearly recognises the magnificence and abiding significance of Barth's work. He likens the *Church Dogmatics* to the Cathedral at Chartres - an awesome and many-splendoured structure with a great variety of equally impressive detail. Entering it at first one finds it dark but gradually the light begins to shine until eventually the whole splendour is revealed. We are here as with Barth in the midst of something truly magnificent, he writes (27). In consequence other contemporary theologies will begin to look like lecture halls rather than cathedrals; others will stand out as respectable but limited sanctuaries. Another comparison is with a sonata where there is a main theme but others are developed as one goes on. The main theme is however taken up again and again, constantly enriched with new ideas, ever reaching back but always spiralling upwards and forwards. So it is with the *Church Dogmatics*. Or, again, it is compared to a many-faceted crystal. Hunsinger believes the English translation workmanlike but uninspired whereas in the original there is rhythm, music, style, passion, splendid writing. For this "Barth was awarded the prestigious Sigmund Freud prize for the eloquence of his academic prose" (28).

Hunsinger believes that "we are still at the early stages of even understanding what it was Barth has to say" (ix-x). He writes as

follows "this book offers a new way of reading Karl Barth's Dogmatics - one not previously developed in detail" (3). This seems on the surface a somewhat arrogant assertion but in reading his book one found nothing of this in the text. His critique of other writers is full and fair and thoroughly researched and argued. All who gave summaries of the Church Dogmatics he regarded as seeing many fine things about Barth's methodology but failed to understand and interpret others.

Hunsinger looks briefly at Hans Urs von Balthasar who sees Barth moving from dialectic in his earlier theology to analogy. The second is T F Torrance who emphasises Barth's work as primarily objectivistic whereas G C Berkouwer interprets Barth from the standpoint of a principle, that of The Triumph of Grace. Fourthly he looks at the important work of Robert Jenson, an American, who focuses on time and eternity as the key in a well written book. However, Hunsinger finds it "the most provocative, incisive and wrong-headed reading of Barth available in English"(15). All have many good qualities but each falls down in failing to see the variety and complexity of Barth's methodology. Finally, Hunsinger looks at Herbert Hartwell's fine little book which follows the traditional form of the loci by taking up different themes rather than giving an overall interpretation. He admits that he made considerable use of the material in Hartwell though he does not feel this is the right way to follow or the way in which one should best interpret Barth.

By contrast Hunsinger points to the unity, variety and complexity of Barth's work and the need for several motifs to do justice to what Barth has to say and the Hermeneutics that are involved in it. This is not to say that the motifs are simply taken and applied to Barth's writings, rather they inhere in the content and are clues which, taken together and interrelated, show us the shape of Barth's theology. They are in fact derived from its varied yet unified content.

Six motifs reveal the shape of the Church Dogmatics. Each has both a positive and a negative significance.

(1)Actualism

The being of God is defined in action in the history, action and event of Jesus Christ. God's being, as Jünger says, is a being in becoming and is not to be defined from anything outside God himself, from another concept of being. This is written against a static conception of God which has characterised so much theology.

(2)Particularism

We move from the particular to the general and not vice-versa, from the unique mystery of the once-for-all activity of God in Jesus Christ to the more general themes, what was called in earlier times the Scandal of Particularity. This is written against conceiving God in general terms.

(3)Objectivism

God as subject gives himself to be known as object of our faith and knowledge. He is objectively present to us in his revelation yet always sovereign and free in his love and grace. This is written against all ideas of the centrality of human subjectivity.

(4)Personalism

God's revelation in Jesus Christ is, as Calvin said, "Dei loquentis persona, God's personal address to us - the I-Thou relationship. This is written against individualistic piety of an evangelical, pietistic or liberal type.

(5)Realism

This refers to the inadequacy of all human language to be the medium of divine revelation. It cannot literally express who God is but does so by way of analogy, the *analogia fidei*, in contrast to the Roman Catholic idea of *analogia entis*. Put otherwise, since God is the ultimate mystery we can only speak properly about him by the miracle of divine grace as he takes and uses our language to speak his Word, thereby overcoming our intrinsic linguistic incapacity. The same applies, mutatis mutandis, to scripture as God's mode of address to us. It becomes and so is the Word of God as he uses it and speaks to us by means of its witness. This is written against

Literalism and Expressivism, as Hunsinger calls it, the latter against a largely symbolic use of language.

(6)Rationalism

This is used in a very special sense as the *ratio* at the heart of our faith, an *intellectus fidei* - not a use of reason independent of faith. This view derives from the Bible's own method which Barth sees exemplified in Anselm. We do not stand outside the faith but seek to know its meaning from within. Faith seeks understanding, *Credo ut intelligam*, I believe in order that I may understand. Two aspects are indicated by Hunsinger in this whole conception - no knowledge without faith and no faith without knowledge. In other words Barth, while emphasising the personal aspect of faith, never fails to see it as having cognitive aspects included within it. The first of these excludes neutrality, speculation, apologetics or any preconceived system applied to theology. The second points to the cognitive aspect of faith, its inherent rationality. Hunsinger writes "Faith seeking understanding means faith seeking to understand the implications of the cognitive content intrinsic to faith" (55).

Theology in consequence begins with what is given, the reality of God's action in Jesus Christ before it searches out its possibility, how did it happen? It has happened. It does not begin with preconceptions of what is possible but with what actually took place. This is in fact another form of Barth's realism. All this is centred in Jesus Christ and God's revelation in him, a revelation based on the Triune God. Trinity and Christology are intimately and inevitably interrelated.

We come now to the main substance of the book which is to show how all these motifs relate to the reality of God and his action. Hunsinger singles out the Truth of God as the theme to be taken up in the next three chapters. Chapter 4 is Truth as *Mediated Revelation*, Chapter 5, *Truth as Mediated Salvation* and Chapter 6, *Truth as Encounter*.

There are three other chapters in the book which deal less with method than with content - one on divine and human agency in Jesus

Christ based on the Chalcedonian formula, another on the centre, Jesus Christ himself, and the final fairly length chapter on Barth's late work on the knowledge of God extra muros ecclesiae outside the walls of the Church in the world. Barth sees this knowledge as possible but only true insofar as these truths are related to the one truth of God in Jesus Christ.

How then does Barth describe Truth? He sees it as Event and unique in kind (Ch. 3) and having therefore the motifs of actualism and particularism. God cannot be defined in any abstract way since he is the living God and is only known in personal encounter (hence personalism) with him and by his free, sovereign grace through the Holy Spirit. God's Truth is the being of the living God in action, coming to us who are wholly incapable of knowing it and therefore as a miracle pointing to its mystery. The corresponding theological expression of this must take a realistic form, that is, Barth makes use of certain forms of speech and writing to clarify as far as we humanly can the reality of God. He uses the Hegelian term *Aufhebung* which means both elimination and a lifting up or exaltation. Both we and our language are incapable but God first confirms, then takes, annuls the old, and finally lifts it up to correspond in human ways and terms with the divine reality. Yet it is in its own form Truth. So Rationalism is a further motif here.

Another way of speaking of the living, active, dynamic God in relation to us is the phrase *Deus non est in genere*, he is not a species in a common genus. He is not limited or subordinate to anything outside himself. He is the living Truth. God and other realities are separated by what Hunsinger speaks of (and this derives from Barth) as an ontological divide i.e., he is in his being wholly other than we are and we can only know him from his side. Everything save sin has its truth and reality from God. When this is applied to the three aspects mentioned one finds the following.

1 Truth as Mediated: Revelation

Jesus Christ is the revelation of the Truth of God, himself fully God and fully human. God is mediated through him (objectivism). He is the acting Subject and sovereign Lord who gives himself as object to

us to be known. The particularity and uniqueness of revelation are objective. There is and can be no non-objectivity of God.

However, one has to point out that God is objective to himself in what Barth calls a primary objectivity before he is objective to us in revelation. He is the Father who knows the Son and the Son who knows the Father by the Holy Spirit, the one Triune God. The objectivity of revelation is thus a secondary and mediated one. Second, it is mediated in the human nature of Jesus - the *Deus Revelatus* is a *Deus Absconditus*. Veiled in flesh the Godhead seen - hidden in form as man and in content as the Triune God. This means that the Truth of God is his inconceivable freedom, not one which is rationally comprehensible. It expresses his concern for us in our sinful humanity. Were God to come to us in naked objectivity we would experience his wrath and not his Grace. His manner of acting gives us the possibility of true cognition of God. This is the Godward side.

The other is the human subjective side of Revelation, the reality of its knowledge by us. This is to be seen in Jesus in his humanity, in this particularity. In the first instance God was ready for us, to come to be with us. In coming in the man Jesus we meet with the one man who is ready for God. He takes our place, exercises a vicarious faith and points to our incapacity for revelation. Our being with God is objectively *real and actual* in the man Jesus. We ourselves are completely closed against grace. This unreadiness for grace is seen particularly in natural theology. In a lengthy interpretation of Barth's opposition to natural theology, Hunsinger points out that Barth sees it violating God's objectivity, his actualism and his particularism in Jesus Christ. Natural theology is not mediated but immediate, not unique but generally given, not miraculous but natural. It denies the miracle of grace and our human incapacity. Mediated subjectivity i.e., the openness and readiness of the human for God, is found only in the existence of the man Jesus - the one man for all humanity involving an ontological relationship between him and all of us. What he is and does for us is done for us objectively and actualised in us by his Word and the Holy Spirit.

Our knowing God therefore is based on Jesus' knowing for we are changed and lifted up to participate in his cognition (realism). Actualism is seen in our being included in a miraculous event. Particularism points again to the once-for-all-ness of it and personalism to our sharing with Jesus in fellowship with God. Hunsinger writes "Jesus Christ in his humanity is the mediator of our subjective access to God" (102).

TRUTH AS MEDIATED SALVATION

This next large section is in fact the doctrine of reconciliation. Hunsinger calls the work of salvation 'soteriological Objectivism'. Jesus Christ is the only mediator of salvation as of revelation. This has a primary and a secondary form intimately interrelated. The primary side is Christ's reconciliation which is all-inclusive, universal. This is determinative, creative: the secondary side is responsive and receptive. The all-inclusive reconciliation involves and elicits this secondary human faith, gratitude and obedience. These two cannot be synthesised but retain a conceptual paradox. The inclusion of all in Christ is objectively real; our knowledge and reception of this reality is an actualist faith. 'The paradox which results at this point is taken as the conceptual emblem of an underlying mystery' (110) - a conjunction of opposites and so a form of realism. Yet a real salvation is valid and efficacious without our response since it already includes us; nevertheless it is to be attested, acknowledged, confirmed and believed by the Holy Spirit through faith - a complex texture of mystery.

But what does this mean? It can be stated as follows:-

The objective reconciliation of God in Jesus Christ is one in which the man Jesus represents our humanity in its true reality - in union and true fellowship with God.

Jesus Christ is the one man for all humanity ; therefore we as humans are included *realiter* in what he is and has done. In this sense we are 'in Christ' but not yet in the Pauline sense. Paradoxically, however, the lives we live at present are not actually true since inexplicably in folly we deny our true being and live in sin. It is only as we acknowledge in faith what we really are in Christ that

we become Christians in fact. Moreover, we cannot do this except by grace and the power of the Holy Spirit. In one sense, therefore, in Christ, all are objectively free, true humans; in another sense, this is only ours in the Spirit and by faith. Again, on the one hand it is impossible for us to undo the inclusive work of Christ; on the other hand we do this wrong, absurd, incredible thing and live in unfreedom - what Barth calls 'the impossible possibility'.

The totality of our salvation is thus included in this one man who is no isolated phenomenon but the one man for all humanity and all creation. This is one of many modifications Barth makes to former traditional theology. It has therefore a thrust towards actual universalism. As contrasted with the older view that only some will be saved, only a number are elect, and others are condemned, Barth sounds a hopeful note towards the end of his writings: Can we not hope and pray for this? Yes we may, is the answer. On the other hand there is the fact of disobedience so that Barth never takes up a specifically universalistic view. He believes the alternatives to his view, for example, in rigid Calvinism are less acceptable and lead indeed to a God inscrutable in his decree and going, as he puts it, behind the back of Christ in what he does. Whereas for Barth, everything must be centred in Jesus Christ. As Hunsinger puts it Barth points to a degree in a universalist direction but never reaches it. Human rejection is inexplicable but allowed to stand. The inexplicable tension remains and Barth avoids saying 'all will be saved' just as he does saying 'not all will be saved'. The scriptures leave us in our working out of its testimony with a reverent agnosticism regarding the fate of all humanity. At the same time its note is primarily a note of victory as it points to the superabounding superiority and triumph of grace. Jesus is victor and will be so to all eternity.

Reconciliation is therefore fully accomplished but ultimate redemption awaits the revelation of the future children of God and of a new heaven and a new earth. Over against this objectivist view Barth criticises (a) the individualist type of Bultmann and (b) the social or cultural type where it is what we do in aid in social welfare and in cultural, political advancement of people that is important.

Social witness certainly has a place but always exists for the sake of the gospel. And (c) the sacramental type, where sacraments become human means of grace.

TRUTH AS ENCOUNTER

In this third main chapter Hunsinger takes up the theme of *Truth as Encounter* which has as its main motif Personalism. This can be put in summary form as follows: Truth involves us in the whole person meeting with God. We recognise the truth of our being in Jesus Christ as we participate in and meet with him, have fellowship with him bear witness to his salvation. Salvation is to be realised subjectively in an existential transformation of our being. It does and must affect us; it does not and cannot come from us but must be received by us. However, our recognition and reception of it does not make it true. Rather its reality and truth bring about its recognition in awakening us to new life. It is a concrete event in us (and so the actualist motif is found here).

In vocation there are three main areas:

(i) *The event of vocation*

What Christ had done for us (*extra nos*) now becomes a reality in us by God's calling us in Christ to himself. Vocation takes place as God meets with us and we with him. He does so in Jesus Christ in the glory of the Mediator. In this calling by Christ to himself there are various aspects:

(a) We are addressed and acknowledged fully as persons. The Word claims and confirms us as such.

(b) In vocation it is a matter of mutual self-involvement - the innermost being of God in Christ's cross on the one hand and our personal reception of it as whole persons on the other. This knowledge in encounter is both informative and transforming.

(c)It reveals to us our sin as nothing else can. It means Christ's call to conversion and his effecting of that change powerfully in us reconstituting our existence wholly on himself alone.

(d)In the course of this we become new persons, a new creation in Christ Jesus. The word of Christ meets us with 'inwardly victorious power'.

There are two main aspects in this - 'Illumination' and 'Awakening' - indicating a new human subject open to the glory of the Mediator and brought into a living relationship with him. Put simply this is the work of the Holy Spirit making God's salvation shine in us from within and enabling us by his power to appropriate the word of the cross.

(ii)Vocation also means fellowship since God seeks fellowship with us, is a God of sociality, the triune God. Fellowship is his highest blessing as his self-giving, uniting us intimately with himself by the Spirit. This involves mutual coinherence - God in us and we in him. It means a kinship of being - similar to the Orthodox theiosis or divinisation though not quite. It goes beyond fellowship to family and beyond this, the union. We know and are in the most intimate way children of God, have a being with him, an ontological relationship.

(iii)Vocation as witness and its relation to eternal life

While fellowship and unity are the goals they are not, in one sense, the ultimate end which is eternal life. The penultimate is not simply our conversion as Christians but our calling to be witnesses. Christ's prophetic office is seen as the risen Christ reaching out and speaking his word by the Holy Spirit directly to us, declaring and making known the priestly work of the cross. Witness shares in this prophetic office: eternal life shares in the royal office, in the splendour of the glorified Christ. Witness is thus the goal of vocation, the task, the privilege of every Christian and of the Church as community.

In the whole area of God's activity with us and ours with him, of divine and human agency we meet with the miracle of grace which in turn points to the mystery of God's action and how we receive it by the Holy Spirit. We are active subjects as well as passive objects. When one relates this to the foregoing and to the varied motifs that Hunsinger indicates one gets something like the following picture. In each and all of these Jesus Christ is the living centre in the grace and glory of his universal reconciling, mediating work. This does not exclude but implies scripture, church, confessions and theology. Briefly these interrelationships can be put in the following ways.

Realism means that when the scripture is used as text, the words are taken, lifted up in all their inadequacy and weakness to correspond to the truth to which the witness points. Rationalism begins with the givenness of the faith with the *credo*, presupposes realism and meditates upon the truth of Christ's person and work and tests the validity of our doctrinal beliefs. These beliefs form no logical system but assume an irresolvably antithetical form. This means that they correspond to the nature of Christ as divine-human in one and have essentially a miraculous, mysterious, paradoxical form. Actualism and particularism point to truth as event and as unique in kind. Objectivity indicates the mediation of God's revelation and salvation in Christ through our humanity and events in time and space and so bring us to a knowledge of God. Truth as encounter is an actualistic event, a real meeting with the risen lord. Now none of these has any real meaning in themselves or all together but only in relation to the person of Jesus Christ. It is as he is the centre of God's activity in revelation and salvation and we have faith in him that these have an important role to play in interpreting the varied, complex structure of the faith in all its majesty, miracle and mystery as well as indicating its basic simplicity in the one Lord Jesus Christ.

In conclusion a few comments on the foregoing are necessary.

First, Hunsinger is right in seeing various motifs operative in the Church Dogmatics. We agree especially with the first four - Actualism, Particularism, Objectivism and Personalism. More surprising is his use of Realism to speak of the inability of our

language rightly to express the miracle and mystery of God and his action. One could better use in this connection 'linguistic incapacity'. Again for 'Rationalism' we would prefer 'Rationality', the ratio given in the content of our faith. Rationalism tends to denote reason without faith. Further, Realism in Barth means almost the opposite of what Hunsinger takes it to mean - it expresses who God really is and what he has done for us in Jesus Christ. We really are in Him. What Realism is is seen in Jesus Christ in Barth's Christological concentration. In this respect several alterations of motifs would be more in keeping with what Barth actually intends.

Further, while it is true that Barth has a unity within his diversity of motifs, Hunsinger never says what it is. However in various places in the *Church Dogmatics*, especially in IV/3, Barth sees it as 'the biblical thought form'. This is the unifying motif behind all the others. By this is meant that in our thinking and writing we follow the path taken in scripture, namely from God to us and, only then, vice-versa. In this way theology will be set on the straight and narrow, right road. Only God can come and act to be with us and we cannot know and believe in Him otherwise than in his revelation in Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit.

The final point is this: the choice of Truth with its related strong cognitive element was not perhaps the happiest one to have as the central theme of the main chapters of the book. As Hunsinger points out, Barth, of course, sees Truth in the biblical sense as intimate personal knowledge, the free personal coming of the living God to us in Jesus Christ, the Truth, as well as the Way and the Life. While this is clearly pointed out, nonetheless the impression is given in this area, and in other areas of the book, that the cognitive element is too predominant, more so than in Barth himself. When theology is conceptualised in this way it is difficult to express the living, free nature of the living God and of the living Lord Jesus Christ who is at the very heart and centre of what we believe and the one in whom we believe.

John Thompson
Union Theological College